

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXIX.]

JULY, 1851.

[VOL. VII.

HORACE WALPOLE.*

ANOTHER series of Walpole's Correspondence! quoth the wondering public. When will it end? What can these volumes be about? Did the man spend his life in writing letters? Such might be the exclamations of those who are acquainted with Horace Walpole only from reading Mr. Bentley's advertisements. Yet we apprehend that all who, like ourselves, have ere now found these letters a pleasant fire-side companion, and the most attractive of volumes in steam-boat and railway, will thankfully receive the gift and ask no questions. Would that more vicarages in England could produce as precious a deposit from the muniment chest as Aston! The wonder unfortunately is, that these have not long ago seen the light. We fear that we must take the publisher's announcement of "positively the last series," in a more literal sense than such announcements usually need, and really bid farewell to the pleasant guide with whom we have so often explored nooks and corners of the eighteenth century.

The present volumes contain a correspondence between a poet and a dilettante litterateur, if we may coin a phrase so barbarously hybrid. The editor puts them forward as containing literary information of peculiar interest. We did not imagine that the assertion could have any possible good foundation, and the perusal has confirmed our anticipation. For the literary centre of the period to which these letters chiefly refer was not Walpole in his lath and plaster castle, or Mason in his prebend's stall at York, or even Gray in the scholastic seclusion of Pembroke College. To all of these, literature was not a profession, but an amusement. To have become as important as they perhaps fancied themselves, they needed the strong impulse of starvation. The men about whom we care most to hear were assembled round Sir Joshua's slovenly dinner-table, or surrendering themselves to the festive impulses of the moment at the literary club. Johnson, Goldsmith, Reynolds, Burke, Gibbon, Percy, with Boswell watching with the observant eye of a crouching spaniel, fawning upon either kicks or caresses,—and in the far north, the stalwart figures of the countrymen he neglected and affected to despise, Hume, Robertson, Smith,—these are the men about whom every trivial anecdote is valuable, and precisely these of whom Walpole tells us nothing. Fortunately, with Boswell at our elbow, we can do without him.

Mason was the incumbent of a Yorkshire living and a prebendary of York,—the author of certain laboured odes and tragedies after the Greek

* The Correspondence of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, and the Rev. William Mason; now first published from the original MSS. Edited, with Notes, by the Rev. J. Mitford. 2 vols. 8vo. London—Bentley. 1851.

model, which enjoyed to the full the inevitable unpopularity,—the writer, as now acknowledged, of the once famous “Heroic Epistle” to Sir William Chambers, and of other satirical poems, somewhat less noted in their own day, and now sharing the same oblivion. All this and more he might have been without attracting Walpole’s attention and correspondence; but he was also the biographer of Gray, and Walpole one of Gray’s earliest friends. Hence the correspondence, which begins with courtesies happily not uncommon between men of letters, rapidly ripens into familiarity under the influence of mutual regard, and finally ceases from various causes of pique, only to be resumed a few months before the death of each. Their politics were alike; and Mason, for a clergyman, was a bold and outspoken politician. Walpole supplied materials and assistance through the press to satires which excited no small interest and curiosity, yet never were suspected to proceed from an obscure Yorkshire vicarage. No country parson could possibly know as much of the personal history and peculiarities of the courtier; the owner of Strawberry Hill, if ever suspected, was known to have retired from political life, and, moreover, to be totally incapable of such versification. The union of the two was never surmised. And, though admitting that the secret history of the “Heroic Epistle” is curious and worth knowing, we cannot imagine that the general public will feel much interest in a satire of which but few have ever heard, and probably none will ever read.

Walpole and Gray had been schoolfellows at Eton and fellow-students at Cambridge. At the conclusion of their college course they went abroad together, quarrelled at Reggio, and parted. It is allowed on every hand that there were faults on both sides. It will be seen that Walpole generously charges himself with the chief blame. We can, however, readily believe that Gray was not altogether faultless, from the contrast between the affectionate respect with which Walpole treats his memory, and the following trustworthy account of his own conduct. The Rev. Wm. Cole, an intimate friend of both parties, says (*Mitford’s Life of Gray*, p. 9), “When matters were made up between Gray and Walpole, and the latter asked Gray to Strawberry Hill, when he came he without any ceremony told Walpole, that he came to wait on him as civility required, but by no means would he ever be there on the terms of his former friendship, which he had totally cancelled,”—words which, if uttered, did no credit either to the poet’s kindness of heart or gentlemanly feeling. Compare the tone of the following passages:

“What shall I say? How shall I thank you for the kind manner in which you submit your papers to my correction? But if you are friendly, I must be just. I am so far from being dissatisfied, that I must beg leave to sharpen your pen, and in that light only, with regard to myself, would make any alterations in your text. I am conscious that in the beginning of the differences between Gray and me, the fault was mine. I was too young, too fond of my own diversions—nay, I do not doubt, too much intoxicated by indulgence, vanity, and the insolence of my situation, as a Prime Minister’s son, not to have been inattentive and insensible to the feelings of one I thought below me; of one, I blush to say it, that I knew was obliged to me; of one whom presumption and folly perhaps made me deem not my superior *then* in parts, though I have since felt my infinite inferiority to him. I treated him insolently: he loved me, and I did not think he did. I reproached him with the difference between us, when he acted from conviction of knowing he was

my superior; I often disregarded his wish of seeing places, which I would not quit other amusements to visit, though I offered to send him to them without me. Forgive me, if I say that his temper was not conciliating. At the same time that I will confess to you that he acted a more friendly part, had I had the sense to take advantage of it; he freely told me of my faults. I declared I did not desire to hear them, nor would mend them. You will not wonder that with the dignity of his spirit, and the obstinate carelessness of mine, the breach must have grown wider till we became incompatible. After this confession, I fear you will think I fall far short of the justice I promised him, in the words which I should wish to have substituted to some of yours. If you think them inadequate to the state of the case, as I own they are, preserve this letter, and let some future Sir John Dalrymple produce it to load my memory; but I own I do not desire that any ambiguity should aid his invention to forge an account for me. If you have no objection, I would propose your narrative should run thus, and contain no more, till a more proper time shall come for stating the truth, as I have related it to you. While I am living, it is not pleasant to read one's private quarrels discussed in magazines and newspapers.

"In section second:

"But I must here add, in order to forewarn my readers of a disappointment, that this correspondence (viz. during his travels) is defective towards the end, and includes no description either of Venice or its territory, the last place which Mr. Gray visited. This defect was occasioned by an unfortunate disagreement between him and Mr. W., which, arising from the great differences of temper between the pensive, curious philosophy of the former, and the gay and youthful inconsideration of the latter, occasioned their separation at Reggio."

"Note to be added:—'In justice to the memory of so respectable a friend, Mr. W. enjoins me to charge him with the chief blame in their quarrel, confessing that more attention, complaisance and deference on his part to a warm friendship, and to a very superior understanding and judgment, might have prevented a rupture that gave much uneasiness to both, and a lasting concern to the survivor, though in the year 1744 a reconciliation was effected between them by a lady, who wished well to them both.'

"This note, I think, will specify all that is necessary, and though humiliating to me, it is due to my friend, and a vindication I owe him. It is also all that seems necessary in section the second or fourth. As to section third, it is far from accurate, and in one respect what I am sure you will have too much regard to me to mention, as it would hurt me in a very sensible part. You will I am sure sacrifice it to my entreaty, especially as it is to introduce nothing to the prejudice of Mr. Gray; nay, I think he would rather dislike the mention,—I mean the place that I might have obtained for him from my Father. That I should have tried for such emolument for him, there is no doubt; at least have proposed it to him; though I am far from being clear he would have accepted it. I know that till he did accept the Professorship from the Duke of Grafton, it was my constant belief that he would scorn any place. My inclination to be serviceable to him was so intense, that when we went abroad together, I left a will behind, in which I gave him all I then possessed in the world—it was indeed a very trifling all. In regard to what my Father would have done, let me recal the period to you, or tell it to you, if you do not know it. I came over in the end of September; my Father resigned in the beginning of the following February. Considering how unfavourable to him the new Parliament was, it would, I believe, with any partiality to me, have been impossible for him to have given away any place worth Gray's acceptance, but to a Member of Parliament, during those four critical months; but this, my dear Sir, is not the part that touches me most. They are your kind words, *favourite Son*. Alas! if I ever was so, I was not so thus early; nor, were I so, would I for the world have such a word dropped;

it would stab my living brother to the soul, who, I have often said, adored his Father, and of all his children loved him the best. You see, I am making a pretty general confession, but can claim absolution on no foundation but that of repentance; you will at least, I am sure, not wound an innocent, meritorious brother from partiality to me. Do just as you think fit about his letters to me; I never thought above a very few proper for publication, but gave them up to you to prove my deference and unreserve. As I still think them charming, I beg to have them again; I have scarce any of his letters that I can call literary, for they only relate to informations he gave me for my own trifling books; and I should be ashamed to shew how ill I employed such time as his."—Pp. 56—60.

On receipt of Mason's *Life of Gray*, he writes,—

"Of my two friends and me, I only make a most indifferent figure. I do not mean with regard to parts or talents. I never one instant of my life had the superlative vanity of ranking myself with them. They not only possessed genius, which I have not,—great learning, which is to be acquired, and which I never acquired; but both Gray and West had abilities marvellously premature. What wretched boyish stuff would my contemporary letters to them appear, if they existed; and which they both were so goodnatured as to destroy! What unpoetic things were mine at that age, some of which unfortunately do exist; and which I yet could never surpass; but it is not in that light I consider my own position. We had not got to Calais before Gray was dissatisfied, for I was a boy, and he, though infinitely more a man, was not enough so to make allowances. Hence am I never mentioned once with kindness in his letters to West. This hurts me, for him as well as myself. For the oblique censures on my want of curiosity, I have nothing to say. The fact was true; my eyes were not purely classic; and though I am now a dull antiquary, my age made me then taste pleasures and diversions merely modern. I say this to you, and to you only, in confidence. I do not object to a syllable. I know how trifling, how useless, how blameable I have been, and submit to hear my faults, both because I have had faults, and because I hope I have corrected some of them; and though Gray hints at my unwillingness to be told of them, I can say truly that to the end of his life he neither spared the reprimand nor mollified the terms, as you and others know, and I believe have felt.

"These reflections naturally arose on reading his letters again, and arose in spite of the pleasure they gave me, for self will intrude, even where self is not so much concerned. I am sorry to find I disobliged Gray so very early. I am sorry for him that it so totally obliterated all my friendship for him; a remark the world probably, and I hope, will not make, but which it is natural for me, dear Sir, to say to you. I am so sincerely zealous that all possible honour should be done to my two friends, that I care not a straw for serving as a foil to them. And as confession of faults is the only amendment I can now make to the one disobliged, I am pleased with myself for having consented, and for consenting as I do, to that public reparation. I thank you for having revived West and his, alas! stifled genius, and for having extended Gray's reputation. If the world admires them both as much as they deserved, I shall enjoy their fame—if it does not, I shall comfort myself for standing so prodigiously below them, as I do even without comparison."—Pp. 105, 106.

The following is interesting, as throwing light on the writer's general character, as well as his feelings on this particular point:

"If your aphorism and the inference you draw from it did not seem to include a compliment, I would thank you, dear Sir, for your letter as the kindest possible; for you reprove me like a friend, and nothing comes so welcome to me as to be told of my faults,—the great business of my life being to mend as many, at least as much of them, as I can. It is for this reason that, though I have lived many useless years, yet I shall never think I have

lived too long, since, if I do not flatter myself, I have fewer faults than I had. The consciousness of the number still humbles me, and causes the self-dissatisfaction you have perceived; and which I hope you will no longer call self-love, but a great desire of meriting my own esteem. When I have acquired that, I will eagerly claim the friendship you are so good as to offer me. At present I am in the predicament of devout persons, who sincerely reject all praise, and sigh if they are commended.

"With the same spirit of verity I allow the force of all your arguments—nay, I go farther. Whatever I feel on my own account, I had rather be mortified than subtract a tittle from the honour your pen is conferring on my two dead friends. It would be base to rob their graves, to save my own vanity; and give me leave to say, that were I capable of asking it, you would be scarce less culpable in granting it. I communicated to you the reflections that naturally arose to my mind on reading your work; but I prefer truth and justice to myself, and for a selfish reason too; I mean, I had rather exercise those virtues, than have my vanity gratified; for I doubt whether even you and La Rochefoucault will not find that the love of virtue itself is founded on self-love,—at least I can say with the strictest veracity, that I never envied Gray or West their talents: I admired Gray's poetry as much as man ever did or will. I do wish that I had no more faults than they had! I must say, too, that though I allow he loved me sincerely in the beginning of our friendship, I wish he had felt a little more patience for errors that were not meant to hurt him, and for that want of reflection in me which I regret as much as he condemned. I have now done with that subject, and will now say no more on it."—Pp. 113—115.

Our extracts on this subject have been somewhat lengthy, because we felt that they supplied materials for a juster estimate of Walpole's character than is usually made. It has been the fashion to decry the man, while admiring his writings. He has been represented as a trifling, careless, heartless dilettante, to whom the paltriest trinket in his collection was more valuable than his dearest friend,—a writer fluent in phrases, whose affectation was pushed to the extreme of insincerity and deliberate self-falsification,—an aristocrat by birth, education and predilection, who perpetually prated of liberty, yet never lifted a finger to aid her cause. We are fully convinced that, according to the ordinary rules of historical evidence, it would be easy to blot out the least agreeable traits of this portrait, by citations from Walpole's writings, and facts of his life. Such is, at present, not our object. Yet let us for a moment stay to consider what right we have to blame him for preferring the quiet of Strawberry Hill, his architectural schemes, his antiquarian collections and researches, his printing-press and his letter-writing, to the fatigues of the House of Commons, and the laborious splendour of Downing Street? He did not leave the latter untried; he retired from public life only when he found that he was unfit for it, and it for him. Had he not directed the energies of his mind in the direction open and appropriate to them, posterity would never have had occasion to find fault with him; he would have occupied about the same place in English Biography as his own brother or the second Earl of Chatham; and in losing fame, he would have escaped also a not over-savoury reputation.

He is found fault with as an author. Why? Because, like hundreds more, he misjudged and undervalued his superiors in the republic of letters; and while being absolutely the first of English letter-writers, failed to attain equal rank as a dramatist, a novelist and an historian.

The Mysterious Mother is bad in execution and worse in subject. The Castle of Otranto is a clumsy and extravagant ghost story. The Historic Doubts display more ingenuity than impartiality. Is he, then, to be sneered at because, while elaborating one species of literature to its highest perfection, he has achieved only a moderate success in others? Is it not somewhat unreasonable to expect a good antiquarian to be also an eminent poet? Surely it is enough that he continues a lively and witty man of the world.

But it is alleged that his letters exhibit his character in a mean and despicable light. If so, we have read them wrongly; and in our opinion we are supported by those of his contemporaries who knew him best. He seems, indeed, to have attracted more love than most men, and to have deserved it by the readiness he displayed to make either the important sacrifices or perform the smaller offices of friendship. Before his quarrel with Gray, he had made a will in which he had left him all he possessed,—little enough, it is true, but still sufficient to testify to the warmth of his heart. On two separate occasions afterwards did he offer, we doubt not in all sincerity, to endow an unfortunate friend with half his property. In the peculiarly harassing and difficult circumstances which accompanied the insanity of his nephew, the third Earl of Orford, at the age of sixty and in infirm health he left the repose and the pursuits which long use had endeared and made necessary to him, to assume the guardianship of a mad prodigal and his adulterous wife, and endeavour to restore, by economy and a close attention to painful details of business, the patrimony which his nephew had squandered. But, with all this, he was a literary coxcomb; and his protestations that he looked on himself only as an amateur in letters, and claimed no literary rank, are hollow and insincere. Let those who make the assertion take on themselves the onus of proof. For our own parts, we are content to believe our author's word; and shrink from convicting him out of his own mouth by the short and easy process of asserting him a liar.

There is little more that needs to be said, save by way of introduction to the extracts which follow. There is no unity in a volume of letters, and it is difficult, therefore, to put any into our remarks. The circumstances of the case sufficiently explain why we chiefly quote from Walpole's share of the correspondence. He was a noted letter-writer, living near the centre of interest,—to say the least, compassionate to country friends,—and, indeed, used by Mason as a private newspaper. The latter was residing either at York or Aston, and chiefly writes on personal matters and provincial movements, which have long ago lost any large share of interest. His letters are, nevertheless, more lively and familiar than we should have expected from one whose "singing robes" were a suit of buckram, and whose manners in private life were not without a tinge of clerical stateliness.

We will suppose that our readers feel as little interest as ourselves in the Heroic Epistle and the rest of Mason's satirical productions, and pass them over in silence. We prefer introducing some of Walpole's odd judgments on his contemporaries. Mr. Forster and Mr. Irving have already been severe on him: will this mitigate their wrath? The first extract relates to "She Stoops to Conquer."

"Dr. Goldsmith has written a comedy—no, it is the lowest of all farces; it

is not the subject I condemn, though very vulgar, but the execution. The drift tends to no moral, no edification of any kind; the situations, however, are well imagined, and make one laugh in spite of the grossness of the dialogue, the forced witticisms, and total improbability of the whole plan and conduct. But what disgusts me most is, that though the characters are very low, and aim at low humour, not one of them says a sentence that is natural or marks any character at all. It is set up in opposition to sentimental comedy, and is as bad as the worst of them. Garrick would not act it, but bought himself off by a poor Prologue. I say nothing of Home's Alonzo and Murphy's Alzuma, because as the latter is sense and poetry compared to the former, you cannot want an account of either."—P. 78.

"The republic of Parnassus has lost a member; Dr. Goldsmith is dead of a purple fever, and I think might have been saved if he had continued James's powder, which had had much effect; but his physician interposed. His numerous friends neglected him shamefully at last, as if they had no business with him when it was too serious to laugh. He had lately written epitaphs for them all, some of which hurt, and perhaps made them not sorry that his own was the first necessary. The poor soul had sometimes parts, though never common sense."—P. 138.

The following lively attack on Johnson's style will, we imagine, better chime in with the taste of our own day:

"Sir Joshua Reynolds has lent me Dr. Johnson's *Life of Pope*, which Sir Joshua holds to be a *chef d'œuvre*. It is a most trumpety performance, and stuffed with all his crabbed phrases and vulgarisms, and much trash as anecdotes; you shall judge yourself: he says that all he can discover of Pope's correspondent Mr. Cromwell is that he used to hunt in a tye-wig. The *Elegy* on the Unfortunate Lady, he says, *signifies the amorous fury of a raving girl*; and yet he admires the subject of *Eloisa's Epistle to Abelard*. The machinery in the *Rape of the Lock* he calls *combinations of skilful genius* with happy casualty, in English I guess a lucky thought; publishing proposals is turned into emitting them. But the 66th page is still more curious; it contains a philosophic solution of Pope's not transcribing the whole *Iliad* as soon as he thought he should, and it concludes with this piece of bombast nonsense—he *that runs against time has an antagonist not subject to casualties*. Pope's House here he calls the *House to which his residence afterwards procured so much celebration*, and that *his vanity produced a grotto where necessity enforced a passage*; and that, *of his intellectual character the constituent and fundamental principle was good sense, a prompt and intuitive perception of consonance and propriety*. Was poor good sense ever so unmercifully overlaid by a babbling old woman? How was it possible to marshal words so ridiculously? He seems to have read the ancients with no view but of pilfering monosyllables, utterly insensible to the graces of their simplicity, and these are called standards of biography! I forgot he calls Lord Hervey's challenging Pulteney, *summoning him to a duel*. Hurlothrumbo talked plain English in comparison of this wight on stilts; but I doubt I have wearied you;—send me something to put my mouth in taste again."—II. 171, 172.

Gibbon.

"You will be diverted to hear that Mr. Gibbon has quarrelled with me. He lent me his second volume in the middle of November. I returned it with a most civil panegyric. He came for more incense; I gave it; but, alas! with too much sincerity, I added, 'Mr. Gibbon, I am sorry *you* should have pitched on so disgusting a subject as the Constantinopolitan History. There is so much of the Arians, and Eunomians, and semi-Pelagians; and there is such a strange contrast between Roman and Gothic manners, and so little harmony between a Consul Sabinus and a Ricimer, Duke of the palace, that though you have written the story as well as it could be written, I fear few will have

patience to read it.' He coloured; all his round features squeezed himself into sharp angles; he screwed up his button-mouth, and rapping his snuff-box, said, 'It had never been put together before'—*so well* he meant to add—but gulped it. He meant *so well* certainly, for Tillemont, whom he quotes in every page, has done the very thing. Well, from that hour to this I have never seen him, though he used to call once or twice a week; nor has he sent me the third volume, as he promised. I well knew his vanity, even about his ridiculous face and person, but thought he had too much sense to avow it so palpably. The History is admirably written, especially in the characters of Julian and Athanasius, in both which he has piqued himself on impartiality—but the style is far less sedulously enamelled than the first volume, and there is flattery to the Scots that would choak anything but Scots, who can gobble feathers as readily as thistles. David Hume and Adam Smith are *legislators* and sages; but the homage is intended for his patron, Lord Loughborough. So much for literature and its fops."—II. 141—143.

"The lost sheep is found; but I have more joy in one just person than in ninety-and-nine sinners that do not repent; in short, the renegade Gibbon is returned to me, after ten or eleven weeks, and pleads having been five of them at Bath. I immediately forgave even his return."—II. 150.

"As if anybody loved reading or did read, Mr. Gibbon has treated them with his vast two volumes. I have almost finished the last, and some parts are more entertaining than the other, and yet it has tired me, and so I think it did himself. There is no spirit in it, nor does any one chapter interest one more than another; which is commonly the case of compilations, especially in such an eloquent age as this. Though these volumes are not polished like the first, you see that he is never thinking of his subject, but intending to make his periods worthy of himself. Then he is often obscure, for from the prodigious quantity of matter he frequently is content with alluding to his original, and who for mercy would recur to Sozomen, Jornandez and *Procopius*? Then having both the Eastern and Western Empires on his hands at once, and nobody but *Imbecilles* and their Eunuchs at the head, one is confused with two subjects that are quite alike, though quite distinct, and in the midst of this distraction enters a deluge of Alans, Huns, Goths, Ostrogoths and Visigoths, who with the same features and characters are to be described in different terms, without any essential variety, and he is to bring you acquainted with them when you wish them all at the bottom of the Red Sea. He has made me a present of these volumes, and I am sure I shall have fully paid for them when I have finished them. One paragraph I must select, what I believe the author did not intend should be applicable to the present moment: 'The Armorican provinces of Gaul and the greatest part of Spain were thrown into a state of disorderly independence by the confederations of the Bagaudæ; and the Imperial ministers pursued with proscriptive laws and ineffectual arms the rebels whom they had made.' End of Chapter xxxv. This is also a sample of the style, which is translating bad Latin into English, that may be turned into classic Latin. I was charmed, as I owned, with the enamel of the first volume, but I am tired by this rhetoric diction, and wish again for Bishop Burnet's *And so*. They who write of their own times love or hate the actors, and draw you to their party; but with the fear of the *laws* of history before his eyes, a compiler affects you no more than a Chancery-suit about the entail of an estate with whose owners you was not acquainted." II. 158—160.

Lord Chesterfield.

"I was too late for the post on Thursday, and have since got Lord Chesterfield's Letters, which, without being well entertained, I sat up reading last night till between one and two, and devoured above 140. To my great surprise, they seem really written from the heart, not for the honour of his head, and in truth do no great honour to the last, nor shew much feeling in the

first, except in wishing for his son's fine gentlemanhood. He was sensible what a cub he had to work on, and whom two quartos of licking could not mould, for cub he remained to his death. The repetitions are endless and tiresome. The next volume, I see, promises more amusement, for in turning it over I spied many political names. The more curious part of all is, that we perceive by what infinite assiduity and attention his Lordship's own great character was raised and supported; and yet in all that great character what was there worth remembering but his *bons mots*? His few fugitive pieces that remain shew his genteel turn for songs and his wit; from politics he rather escaped well than succeeded in them. In short, the diamond owed more to being brilliant and polished and well set, than to any intrinsic worth or solidity."—I. 140, 141.

Chatterton.

"It is not unlucky that I have got something to divert my mind; for I can think on other subjects when I have them. I am at last forced to enter into the history of the supposed Rowley's poems. I must write on it,—nay, what is more, print, not directly, controversially, but in my own defence. Some jackanapes at Bristol, I don't know who, has published Chatterton's works; and, I suppose to provoke me to tell the story, accuses me of treating that marvellous creature with contempt; which having supposed, contrary to truth, he invites his readers to feel indignation at me. It has more than once before been insinuated that his disappointment from me contributed to his horrid fate. You know how gently I treated him. He was a consummate villain, and had gone enormous lengths before he destroyed himself. It would be cruel indeed if one was to be deemed the assassin of every rogue that miscarries in attempting to cheat one; in short, the attack is now too direct not to be repelled. Two months ago I did draw up an account of my share in that affair. That narrative, and an answer to this insult which I wrote last night, I will publish, signed with my name, but not advertised by it. It will reach all those that take part in the controversy, and I do not desire it should go further. These things I will have transcribed, and ask your leave to send you before they go to press. I am in no hurry to publish, nor is the moment a decent one; yet I embrace it, as I shall be the less talked over. I hate controversy, yet to be silent now would be interpreted guilt; and it is impossible to be more innocent than I was in that affair. Being innocent, I take care not to be angry. Mr. Tyrwhitt, one of the enthusiasts to Rowley, has recanted, and published against the authenticity of the poems. The new publisher of Chatterton's undisputed works seems to question the rest too; so his attack on me must be mere impertinent curiosity. One satisfaction will arise from all this,—the almost incredible genius of Chatterton will be ascertained. He had generally genuine powers of poetry, often wit, and sometimes natural humour. I have seen reams of his writing, beside what is printed. He had a strong vein of satire too, and very irascible resentment; yet the poor soul perished before he was nineteen! He had read and written as if he was fourscore, yet it cannot be discovered when or where. He had no more principles than if he had been one of all our late administrations. He was an instance that a complete genius and a complete rogue can be formed before a man is of age. The world has usually the honour of their education; but it is not necessary. You see by Chatterton that an individual could be as perfect as a senate."—II. 4, 5.

Hume.

"Hume's *Life*, written by himself, is just published. It is a nothing, a brief account of his disappointments on his irreligious works making no noise at first, and his historic making some. He boasts that in the latter he dared to revive the cause of despotism—a great honour, truly, to a philosopher; and he speaks of your friend Bishop Hurd with a freedom that I dare to say the whole court will profess to his Lordship they think monstrous rudeness. My

Lord H., whose piety could swallow Hume's infidelity, will be shocked now that he should have employed such a brute."—I. 270, 271.

Dramatic Gossip.

"I was very wise in never advertising retirement. I knew well how difficult it is to quit the world, and yet I have done with it. The love of fame has its colt's tooth as well as old ladies. Alas! my good friend, heroes, philosophers, statesmen, have their itchings left, though their all needs have been all fully satisfied. Poor Mr. Garrick labours under this infirmity of age; he has complained of Mons. Le Texier for thinking of bringing over Caillaud, the French actor in the opera comique, as a mortal prejudice to his reputation; and no doubt would be glad of an Act of Parliament that should prohibit there ever being a good actor again in any country or century. But this is not all; he has solicited King George to solicit him to read a play. The piece was quite new, *Lethe*, which their Majesties have not seen above ten times every year for the last ten years. He added three new characters equally novel, as a Lady Featherby, because the Queen dislikes feathers. The piece was introduced by a prologue *en Fable*: a blackbird, grown grey-haired, as blackbirds are wont to do, had retired from the world, but was called out by the Eagle. Mr. Hare asked Garrick if his Majesty looked very like an Eagle? The audience was composed of King, Queen, Princess Royal, Duchess of Argyll, Lady Egremont, Lady Charlotte Finch; the Prince of Wales was not present; and all went off perfectly ill, with no exclamations of applause, and two or three formal compliments at the end. Bayes is dying of chagrin, and swears he will read no more."—I. 267, 268.

"I wish it was possible to give you a full account of a tragedy that has just been lent to me,—an adequate one is totally impossible. The Bishop-Count of Bristol, whom I met t'other night at Mrs. Delany's, desired to send me a play, that he confessed he thought equal to the noblest flights of Shakspeare. Such an honour was not to be refused. Arrived the thickest of quartos, full as the egg of an ostrich; with great difficulty I got through it in two days. It is on the story of Lord Russel. John Lilburne himself could not have more Whig zeal. The style, extremely deficient in grammar, is flogged up to more extravagant rants than Statius's or Claudian's, with a due proportion of tumbles into the kennel. The devils and damnation supply every curse with brimstone, and hell's sublime is coupled with Newgate, St. James's and Stock's Market; every scene is detached, and each as long as an act; and every one might be omitted without interrupting the action, for plan or conduct there is none. Jefferies and Father Petre open the drama, and scourge one another up to the blackest pitch of iniquity. They are relieved by Algernon Sidney and Lord Howard; the first rants like a madman, and damns the other to the pit of hell. Lady Russel is not a whit less termagant. The good Earl of Bedford, on the contrary, is as patient as Job, and forgets the danger of his son to listen to the pathetic narrative of his old steward, whose wife had been Lord Russel's nurse, and died at seeing him sent to the Tower. The second act begins and never ends with Lord Bedford's visit to Newgate, where he gives money to the jailor for leave to see his son. The jailor chouses him, calls himself Emperor of Newgate, and promises to support his dignity by every act of royal tyranny; compares himself to Salomeus, and talks of Nabobs, Stock's Alley and Whitfield. Lord Russel comes to the grate, gives more money equally in vain. At last, the monarch jailor demands £1000; Russel promises it; the jailor tenders a promissory note; Lord Russel takes it to sign, and finds it stipulates £7000, and so on. King Charles and the Duke of York enter, quarrel about religion, but agree on cutting Lord Essex's throat, with many such pathetic amenities. The last act contains the whole trial *verbatim*, with the pleadings of the Attorney and Solicitor Generals. Tillotson and Burnet are called to the prisoner's character,—in vain,—he is condemned. Lord Bedford falls at the King's feet begging his son's life; the King tells

him he teazes him to death, and that he had rather be still in Scotland listening to nine hours' sermons, delivered

Through the funnel
Of noses lengthened down into proboscis.

This is the only flower I could retain of so dainty a garland. The piece concludes with Lady Russel's swooning on hearing two strokes of the axe. Now you are a little acquainted with our second Shakspeare! Be assured that I have neither exaggerated in the character given, nor in the account of this tedious but very diverting tragedy, which, as the Earl-Bishop told me, Mr. Cumberland has had a mind to fit to the stage. What a hissing there would be between his ice and this cataract of sulphur! Adieu. I have broken my word and wrote a volume, but my pen was hurried on by the torrent of lava." II. 263—265.

"I am shocked at myself for having made sport, though innocently, at the tragedy of Lord Russel, as I have since seen the author, who is a poor worthy Irish clergyman, his name Stratford, aged about five-and-forty, of great parts, and not a little mad, as Lord Bristol has owned to me. I found Mr. Stratford so modest, so humble, and so ignorant of the world, that I talked to him very frankly, and in the gentlest terms I could use, representing to him the total impossibility of his play being acted in its present state. I said, I reckoned it immoral to flatter any author in a manner to draw him on to exposing himself, &c. He allowed all my objections which I stated, thanked me with the warmest gratitude, and then broke out on the *magnanimity* of Mr. Cumberland, who had condescended to transcribe his whole play, and begun to alter it. As that magnanimous doctor is so rank a Tory, I was still more surprised.

"The poor man told me he had brought his family over, at an expense he could ill afford, to get some of his plays acted, for he has also written four comedies. Methinks my Lord of Bristol-Derry had better have given him some preferment than let him write himself into a jail, as he probably will. I offered to look over one of his comedies; the next morning he brought me the first scene of one, but it is so metaphorical, so ungrammatical, and he has such a brogue, that I did not guess at the meaning of one sentence. I was forced to take the book out of his hand and read it myself, when I found a profusion of wit and ideas, similes and metaphors so strangely coupled together in the most heterogeneous bands, that every sentence would require a commentary, and deserves one, though you may judge thence how unfit for the stage. He has no notion of simplicity, character or nature, nor I believe of comedy itself; for he owned that he had never looked into Congreve or Vanbrugh; but the strange part of all is, that in the whole scene there is scarce a verb! All consists of metaphors in apposition, and allusions in hints. He laughed when I shewed him that there was nothing but substantives and adjectives. Besides these works he has a poem written long ago in blank verse, on the battle of Fontenoy, in nine cantos. In this he has not discarded one of the eight parts of speech; there are sublime passages, but little invention or novelty, at least in the specimen that I have seen; and the images are too fierce. This he is going to publish by subscription for present subsistence, and I shall toil to raise some money for him. He formerly printed a translation of the first book of Milton into Greek, and the University of Dublin supervised it for him. He repeated some of the lines to the Bishop of St. Asaph in my room, who admired them, and he quoted Hebrew as glibly; and there the Bishop understood him no more than I did his Greek, which I have quite forgotten. The Duke of Devonshire has got his comedy, and I am sorely afraid the poor man's madness will be a jest instead of a matter of compassion; but I shall at least endeavour to make them pay for laughing at a man that ought to be respected. He cannot bear the name of Johnson for his paltry acrimony against Milton; in short, he is a Whig to the marrow."—II. 275—277.

"The newspapers say that Mr. Stratford's Play of Lord Russel has been offered and accepted at Drury Lane—I conclude, cut up for the stage by Master Doctor Cumberland, who, I know, had taken it in hand. What a delicious potion must a bumper of red-hot lava smoking from Vesuvius be, when extinguished by a double quantity of the coldest aconite! But how can the Royalist empiric have been able to convert a Whig bonfire into an illumination to the honour of Majesty? Oh! yes, such things may be: I have seen such."—II. 317.

Burgh on the Trinity. (Mason to Walpole.)

"You say the University of Oxford pouts at me, I know not for why, but in revenge I'll tell you a story about them, which I think you cannot have heard. Last year a young Irish gentleman, Mr. Burgh, who has for some time lived at York, writ a book, called a Scriptural Confutation of Mr. Lindsey's Apology, defending the doctrine of the Trinity in a new and (as we orthodox divines say) masterly manner. To the second edition he set his name, and the University of Oxford met to consider of the propriety of giving him an honorary degree of Master of Arts: after much debate, the intention was put off, *sine die*, at the very meeting when they gave Dr. Johnson a degree of Doctor of Laws. They said he had not laid sufficient stress on natural religion; but the true reason was, that he had in a note abused David Hume, and in a dedication to Edmund Burke doubted a little whether the Royal fountain of honour was much purer than ditch-water. I wish you would look into this dedication, and also p. 197 of his second edition; I think you would be pleased—*au reste*, I can only say that had he writ on any other subject, you would also have been more pleased; for he is a young man of the quickest parts and most general knowledge I ever met with. He is of the Irish House of Commons, and brother-in-law of Mr. Hussey, and one of us, *au merveille*. But is it not curious that on a doctrinal point, in which the Oxonians in particular so much interest themselves, they will not suffer a man to defend their cause who has the misfortune to be a Whig?"—I. 185, 186.

The following is an amusing instance of a mistake. The Memoirs in question were the production of Archdeacon Blackburn:

Walpole to Mason.

"Mr. Hollis's Memoirs are not published, but sent as presents to the elect. They are certainly drawn up by some Dissenter; yet, though often silly, vulgar, ignorant and prejudiced, they contain some curious facts. They shew how the Episcopalian spirit of that arch hypocrite Secker contributed to the American War, and there is one remarkable anecdote breathing the full effluvia of the reign. Mr. Hollis sent to the British Museum a satirical print on the Jesuits. The Trustees would not receive it."—II. 81.

Mason to Walpole.

"I have seen Mr. Hollis's Memoirs; they have done me some good, and have made me relish my old Mother Church better than I have done for some time. I remember some years ago Dr. Kaye preached a sermon in York Minster, in which he praised the excellency of our Ecclesiastical Constitution, its purity, simplicity, &c., so highly, that I whispered the Residentiary that sat next me, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Presbyterian.' These Memoirs have brought me back again to almost my pristine Orthodoxy."—II. 91.

Let the following serve as a specimen of the more serious passages which sometimes elevate these letters above their ordinary level:

"When I am in so grave a strain, I will pass to the latter part of your letter before I reply to other passages in the former part. You amaze me by even supposing that the epitaph I sent you could allude to the immortality of the soul. Believe me, I think it is as serious a subject as you do; nor, I am sure, did you ever hear me treat it lightly. The three last lines which justly offended

you if you so interpreted them, were intended to laugh at the absurd idea of the beatified sitting on golden thrones and chanting eternal Allelujahs to golden harps. When men ascribe their own puerile conceptions to the Almighty Author of all things, what do they but prove that their visions are of human invention? What can be more ridiculous than to suppose that omnipotent goodness and wisdom created and will select the most virtuous of its creatures to sing his praises to all eternity? It is an idea that I think could never have entered but into the head of a king, who might delight to have his courtiers sing birth-day odes for ever. Pray be assured that I never trifle on so solemn and dear an interest as the immortality of the soul; though I do not subscribe to every childish and fantastic employment that silly people have chalked out for it. There is no word in any language expressive enough for the adoration and gratitude we owe to the Author of all good! an eternity of praises and thanks is due to him; but are we thence to infer that *that* is the sole tribute in which he will delight, and the sole occupation he destines for beings on whom he has bestowed thought and reason? The epitaph did not deserve half a line to be said on it; but your criticism, indeed your misconception of it, will excuse my saying so much in my own justification. It is no irreverence to smile at a chorister's notion of Paradise."—II. 356, 357.

Our readers will not be sorry that we have allowed our lively author to speak for himself, and filled up the space at our disposal with his brilliant sketches, rather than our own heavy disquisitions. We have only one word to add. Mr. Bentley announces this as the last series of Walpole's Correspondence. If, after due investigation, this prove to be really the case, why should we not have a cheap and uniform edition of the whole, arranged in chronological order, and illustrated with such notes of the respective editors as seem best worth preservation? We doubt that many would gladly give such an edition a place upon their shelves, whom consideration of expense and the want of uniformity deter from purchasing the other. So popular an author could surely never be a drug on the market.

C.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS AND THEIR EXTENSION.

BY WILLIAM VIDLER.

(Published at the request of the Conference of Domestic Missionaries held at Liverpool, May 1851.)

It is now about twenty years since Dr. Tuckerman, by his earnest and devoted exertions for the spiritual improvement of the poor of Boston in America, combined with the valuable Reports which he published of his proceedings, directed the attention of the Unitarians, both of England and America, to the degraded condition of many of the poorer classes in the large towns,—shewed that many of the evils to which they were subject arose from the want of moral and religious instruction, and that they needed a special Christian agency which should penetrate to their homes, advise them in their difficulties, comfort them in their afflictions, and, in fine, bring the hopes, warnings and promises of the gospel of Jesus to those who were beyond the reach of the ordinary ministrations of religion. As a response to the efforts and appeals of Dr. Tuckerman, several ministers in the United States were set apart to the work, under the title of Ministers at Large; and in England, institutions having a similar object, though

called by the different name of Domestic Missions, were established. The term Domestic Mission was in most instances very appropriately chosen to describe these institutions. The ministers who were to labour in the courts and alleys of the large towns, teaching the ignorant and irreligious, were as truly Missionaries as those who go to convert a heathen and savage tribe. They were *Domestic* Missionaries, for they were to enter the homes of the people with a message of love, and represent the sympathy of the wealthier classes for their less fortunate brethren. Of the towns in this country, London was the first to lead in this work of Christian philanthropy, a Domestic Mission being established there in the year 1832. In the following year, a similar institution was commenced at Manchester. In 1834, a second Mission, situated in a different part of the town from the first, was begun in London; and then at the places and dates as follow, the establishment of Domestic Missions was proceeded with:

Liverpool, 1837.

Bristol, 1839.

Birmingham—Unitarian Domestic Mission, 1840.

New-Meeting Domestic Mission, 1844.

Halifax, 1841.

Leeds, 1844.

Leicester, 1845.

Of these ten Domestic Missions it may be noticed, that none of them can be said to be recent experiments. Several of them have been in active operation for periods varying from ten to eighteen years, and have become large institutions. To some are attached efficient Day and Sunday Schools, Week-evening Classes for children and adults, Libraries, Saving Banks, and what may be truly called Mechanics' Institutes, from the rank in life of those who are members of them. It is not pretended that the modes of operation pursued in all these Missions are exactly alike: that would hardly be desirable, seeing that there is much dissimilarity in the habits of the poor, and even in the social evils which affect them, in different districts. Still more would it be undesirable to attempt in all instances the same plan of operation, from the knowledge which we have of the diversified nature of the gifts which the Great Creator has been pleased to bestow upon man. The peculiar direction of the talents and energies of the Missionary and his coadjutors will impress the character of the institution, and perhaps give a success to plans which would fail in other hands. Thus, from the diversities of the managers, the ministers, their assistants and their people, there is an individuality, so to speak, in each of the Domestic Missions in the country; but, as a whole, there is a remarkable agreement in the objects which are pursued. All have sought for and maintained a kind and Christian intercourse with the poor at their homes, engaged more or less in the moral and religious education of the young, and most of the Domestic Missions have congregations connected with them, to which the ministers regularly officiate, composed of persons who would nearly all have otherwise been strangers to the worship of God.

If the Domestic Missions cannot be said to be recent experiments, still less can they be said to be doubtful ones. The good which they accomplish is precisely that which is the least capable of being ex-

hibited, though the most real and lasting of all the services which can be done by man to man. The feeding of the hungry, and the clothing of the naked, however liable to abuse when done indiscriminately and without judgment, are often necessary deeds of Christian charity, and are at any rate tangible acts; but the great work of the Domestic Mission,—the improvement of the hearts and lives of the people—the making known to them that they are under the moral government of a great and good Father—the clearing away from their minds the mists of ignorance, vice and prejudice, so as to allow the accents of Christ to speak to their souls,—this great work, which, as far as it is accomplished, certainly makes happy homes, good mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, children and parents,—promoting industry, comfort and good citizenship—bestowing blessings for time and eternity,—cannot, from the very nature of man, be shewn in all its results. There is danger even of encouraging spiritual pride and hypocrisy in all attempts to exhibit individual instances of moral and religious conversion. Speaking collectively of the Reports which have been issued by the various Domestic Missions, most of them prepared by the Missionaries—if one of their number may be allowed to give an opinion on a subject which may be almost deemed a personal one—they contain many interesting details of the habits, character and condition of those whose lot in life places them out of the reach of the ordinary observer—many touching incidents illustrating the temptations, trials and sorrows of the poor—and afford much indirect evidence of the lasting good which has been accomplished; at the same time, they speak of the progress and success of educational efforts which have been made in connection with their institutions,—efforts of the value and necessity of which no person is sceptical at the present day. Altogether, it may be claimed fairly for Domestic Missions, that they are not doubtful experiments. Of the ten which have been established, not one has fallen to the ground from want of support—not one has been abandoned on the ground that it has been unproductive of the good which was aimed to be realized. The whole of the ten Missions are at present pursuing their operations, and the sympathy and interest with which they are regarded is becoming extended and deepened in the Christian body which supports them. It would be painful, indeed, if it were otherwise, when it is remembered how much such labours are in accordance with the spirit and precepts of our divine religion, and how much they seem needed to correct some of the evils which have grown up with our civilization.

In looking over the names of the towns in which there are at present Domestic Missions in operation, it will hardly escape notice, that many important places are omitted from the list—that in some of the large manufacturing towns, in which we have influential and wealthy congregations, there are apparently no efforts being made in this great field of Christian usefulness. It cannot be that this arises from there being no need in such places of special exertion for the spread of the gospel among the poor, for all are too familiar with the fact, that in all our large populations there is an amount of ignorance, irreligion and immorality, which from its magnitude seems to defy our most earnest efforts for its reduction, repelling the weak-hearted, the fastidious and the timorous, but stimulating to new exertion the energies

of the true Christian philanthropy which never tires under labour nor faints at difficulties. It would be both narrow-minded and unjust to regard those who are not active in the promotion and support of Domestic Missions, specially so called in the strictest sense, as being thereby indifferent to the claims of their poorer brethren, and as taking no part in those labours for the removal of sin and ignorance to which every disciple of Jesus is called to contribute, by the bestowal of time or money, sympathy and prayer. In many of the towns in which there are no professed Domestic Missions, there are large and flourishing Sunday-schools, which have connected with them earnest and faithful Christian men and women, who devote much time in an intercourse with the poor. It would not be easy to overrate the value of these labours, were they merely looked upon as bridging over the gulf which has separated the wealthy and educated from the poor and ignorant, a separation which has caused misunderstanding on the one hand and bitterness on the other. But they do more than this. Such labourers carry lessons of purity and holiness to many a lowly home, and become the affectionate guardians and instructors of neglected childhood. Many of the institutions which have grown up with the regular Domestic Missions are also to be found in full vigour in connection with a number of the congregations in the large towns—the week-evening Classes, Libraries and Saving Banks, and large Day-schools, admirably effective, which are either wholly or partly supported by the congregations. Where there is so much work being done which is akin to that of the Domestic Mission, it can be of no moment by what name it is called, and there can be but one feeling with which these labours are regarded,—labours which, if they could be carried out extensively, would go far to lessen the necessity for the other agency. As each person must stand or fall to his own Master, so it must be left to each to decide on his own responsibilities, and the sacrifices which he should make for lessening the moral evils which are around him. But it cannot be denied that, in addition to all other efforts, there is abundant room in all our large towns for one or more Domestic Missions, and that, if the means could be provided, they might be established with every prospect of the most beneficial results. The extension of Domestic Missions into those places which are at present without them, while it would be a cheering sign of increased attention to the wants and condition of the poor, and of a Christian interest in their spiritual welfare, would have no tendency to lessen the efficiency of the institutions which are now being carried on, but rather the contrary. Experience has shewn that they tend to develop new energies, call forth new labourers, and extend the favour and support with which all departments of Christian philanthropy are regarded and maintained.

Of the ten Missions at present in operation, all are, with one exception, conducted by ministers who are entirely devoted to the work. The one exception is at Halifax, where the friends, not having the means for the adequate and entire support of a Missionary, were fortunate enough to secure the services of an excellent man who agreed to give up a part of his time to Missionary labours. The results, though not upon the same scale as where the undivided attention of a minister is given, are stated to be most satisfactory, and the plan is

deserving of the consideration of those who, like the society at Halifax, may not have it in their power to maintain a Mission in its full efficiency, but are yet desirous of doing what they can to correct the misery around them, and are able to offer a remuneration which might compensate for the partial services of a competent person to aid them in their efforts.

In looking round and asking where the required competency is likely to be found,—who will be found disposed and at the same time fitted to become what may be called lay Missionaries to the Poor,—it is natural to direct attention to the existing Sunday-schools. They attract as their teachers many earnest and devoted spirits. Some of the older and more experienced of them, especially the superintendents, have a natural sympathy with the Missionary work, and would, it is presumed, be found to have many of the qualifications required. Their knowledge of the children of the poor,—their acquaintance, in many instances, with their homes and parents,—are admirable preparations for their becoming confidential advisers, consolers and teachers of Christ to the adults. With the earnest efforts of ministers and congregations, an agency of this kind, it is believed, might be carried on where there is no probability of maintaining an ordinary Domestic Mission,—that it would call into play talents which are now lying dormant, and help to give a vigorous and healthy direction to the often-expressed desire for greater Christian usefulness.

In conclusion, it may be remarked, that, regarding it as a privilege and a duty for all Christians who have the time and means to become acquainted with one or more of the families of the poor, in order to bestow upon them the reflected advantages of superior knowledge and civilization, the writer, while wishing for the extension of Domestic Missions, must express his conviction, that no deputed agency, though of the highest kind, could compensate for the loss of that intercourse which still happily exists to a great extent between the different classes in England. The poor man's virtue and self-respect are fostered by the notice of his richer neighbour; and the kindness and benevolence of those who, beyond the reach of poverty themselves, employ part of their time and means in ministering to the wants of others, is the twofold blessing which blesses him that gives and him that receiveth. But the poor in our large towns—those that crowd the courts and alleys—they have no neighbours but the poor themselves. The richer and the more educated do not live near them. If left to themselves in the large districts which they inhabit, what can be expected but degradation, want of self-respect, and discontent? Every Christian and benevolent feeling should prompt us to use all efforts from which there seem reasonable hopes of their improvement, and among such efforts a consideration is asked for the claims of the Domestic Mission.

COURAGE.

As soon as a man has a strong conviction that he has within him courage when it may be wanted, he will no longer want to proclaim it to the world.—*Jean Paul.*

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM.*

It is a perfectly reasonable expectation that one who undertakes to discuss the great subject of the origin, nature and authority of Christianity, shall be competent to the statement and consideration of both sides, or rather all sides, of the questions which, in such an investigation, present themselves. To feel, and to arouse in others, doubts and objections in regard to the contents of such books as the Old and New Testaments, is a comparatively easy thing. The ability to do this may be given even by a certain sort and degree of imperfect or half knowledge. But this in itself can confer little right to challenge public attention, or communicate your perplexities indiscriminately to others, whom you may have no opportunity of assisting in the work of further investigation. One, therefore, we repeat, who voluntarily assumes the responsibility of stirring the questions with which this volume is concerned—lying, as those questions do, at the root of the most cherished convictions of multitudes—ought to be sufficiently well furnished with all available knowledge to be able to present a really fair case for consideration. Unless this previous care have been taken, he is sure to put forth much that is crude, one-sided and untrue, in its resulting impression on the mind of an ordinary reader; he is sure, in a word, to do great and various, though it may be unintentional, mischief.

We complain of the work now before us that it does not give proofs of this thorough preparedness on the part of its author, and believe that, with further and easily obtainable knowledge on many points, he would not have sent it forth to the world, at least in its present form. In reference to St. John's Gospel, for example, it is not enough for a writer on the foundation and superstructure of the Creed of Christendom that he be merely sensible of the difficulties and obscurities of this part of the New Testament, or at a loss to understand much of its contents. It may justly be required that he be also intimately acquainted with the works of different learned men, on the conservative as well as the negative side of the subject; that, before he vituperates this Gospel as "commencing with a confused statement of the Platonic doctrine" (p. 158),—as taking "strange liberties with fact" (p. 210),—as representing our Saviour as "absolutely labouring to be unintelligible," and to "perplex and disgust" his hearers (p. 142), and so forth,—he shall have good knowledge of what such men as Lücke, Tholuck and Neander, or even the author's favourite De Wette, have said in its defence, or in explanation of its peculiarities. We look in vain in this volume for the evidence of this indispensable preparatory knowledge. The author, indeed, seems rather to consider it a merit not to possess it. In giving his reasons for the publication of the book, he observes,—

"It was also clear to me that this work must be performed by laymen. Clergymen of all denominations are, from the very nature of their position, incapacitated from pursuing this subject with a perfect freedom from all ulterior considerations. They are restrained and shackled at once by their previous confession of faith, and by the consequences to them of possible conclusions. It remained, therefore, to see what could be done by an unfettered layman,

* The Creed of Christendom; its Foundations and Superstructure. By William Rathbone Greg. Pp. 307. London—Chapman, 1851.

endowed with no learning, but bringing to the investigation the ordinary education of an English gentleman, and a logical faculty exercised in other walks." Pref. p. viii.

Now, that there is some, though by no means the whole, truth in this statement, we are not disposed to deny. And we are glad to see educated laymen in this country taking an interest in these subjects, and discussing them in a calm and reverential spirit. But at the same time, before they speak so confidently of "clergymen of all denominations" as being "incapacitated," we think they should shew that they are themselves better qualified for the task, not boasting themselves "endowed with no learning," but sensible of the importance of the extensive and accurate learning which is really needed for a full and just discussion, and remaining silent until they have obtained it.

In attempting further to review this work and to comment on some of the topics which it introduces, we are necessarily placed at considerable disadvantage. To do anything like justice to our subject would require a volume at least as large as the book itself. We can only, therefore, within the limits of a few pages, select for notice a few prominent points. But we believe we can, within these necessary limits, make it apparent that the present author is by no means a guide to be implicitly followed by those readers who are obliged to take their information on the subjects treated of from the statements of others, and that such persons will do well, therefore, to have recourse to additional sources of knowledge. If we shall sometimes appear needlessly minute, and seem to dwell upon matters of no great importance, the excuse must be that we are obliged simply to follow our author in the topics which he has chosen to bring forward.

The first two chapters of the volume, relating to the inspiration of the Scriptures, we hold to be generally sound, and, as against the common doctrine on this subject, unanswerable. We must add, however, that this part of the volume is entirely a work of supererogation. Not only has all that the author advances been as well said by others before him, but it must surely be a needless beating of the air, for one who believes that the Gospels and other books of the Bible are not even historically trustworthy, to trouble himself with the endeavour to shew that the Scriptures are not inspired. Establish the former proposition, and inspiration falls to the ground, as a matter of course. While admitting, again, the general force of the two chapters in question, we observe that they contain some things from which, had we space, we should record our dissent, as either untrue, or inaccurate statements of truth. Where, for instance, does Mr. Greg learn so certainly that our present canonical writings of the New Testament "were selected out of a number of others" (p. 15), and that they were not from the first in the hands of churches and individuals as documents of acknowledged authority, the productions of apostles and apostolical men? The fact to which he alludes, that "the early Fathers disagreed among themselves in their estimate of the genuineness and authority of many of the books" (ib.), shews, at all events, that attention was given at an early period to the question what books could be properly received as the genuine productions of primitive Christian men; and although we are not so fully informed as we might wish to be as to the reasons which led to the retention of some and the rejection of others, yet, judging

from the internal character of the several books of the New Testament, we may be satisfied that a wise discretion was, on the whole, employed in the formation of our present canon. Where, again, does our author learn that the Gospel of the Egyptians had "as much title to be placed in the sacred canon as some already there," the two or three early notices of this Gospel being entirely of a disparaging character? Where does he learn, also, that the Fathers who lived about the end of the second century A.D. were in the habit of "quoting indiscriminately" apocryphal and canonical Scriptures? His reference to De Wette (p. 54), will not bear out so sweeping an assertion. In the case of Clement of Rome, how does it appear that the words cited are taken from any writing at all? And in the case of the other Clement, Mr. Greg ought not to have passed over the remark of the Father, that the words quoted are not from the four Gospels, but "in that according to the Egyptians," a depreciatory remark indicating anything but an indiscriminate quoting of canonical and apocryphal books.

In his observations on the Pentateuch and the Old-Testament canon generally, our author implicitly follows the work of De Wette, in the translation of that work published some years ago by Mr. Parker. We do not stop to complain of this adherence to a single authority; although it is obvious that a full and impartial treatment of the subject would require some acquaintance with works in which the views of De Wette, and those who think with him, are controverted; and, moreover, the latest edition of De Wette would have been more likely to give the most matured opinions of that eminent scholar. The present writer, following his authority with great confidence, asserts that "the discovery in the temple of the Book of the Law, in the reign of the king, Josiah, about B.C. 624, as related in 2 Kings xxii., is the first certain trace of the existence of the Pentateuch in its present form" (p. 36). This statement means precisely, as we speedily learn, that "the Book of Deuteronomy was written about the time of Josiah, shortly before and with a view to the discovery of the Pentateuch in the temple" (p. 38). What the author intends by the words "with a view to," we do not know, unless it be to impute fraud in some way to those who discovered the Book of the Law. However this may be, the statement that Deuteronomy was now first composed is not warranted by anything here stated by Mr. Greg, so far as we can perceive the force of his reasoning. What he offers evidence for, is the allegation that the Book of Deuteronomy was not in existence at the time of the dedication of the temple by Solomon, from which he jumps to the conclusion that it was not in existence till nearly four hundred years later. But what is the evidence assigned for the allegation mentioned? It is chiefly the statement, 1 Kings viii. 9, "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb," as compared with Deut. xxxi. 24—26, where directions are given to put the Book of the Law in the ark. But all that can be legitimately inferred from the two passages is, either that the historian of Kings was mistaken in saying that the Book was not there at the dedication of the temple; or else that the direction said to have been given by Moses was not obeyed; or, again, if at first obeyed, that the book had been for some cause removed. At any rate, if we must infer that Deuteronomy did not exist because it was not in the ark at the dedication of the temple, so, surely, must we

infer of the rest of the Pentateuch, for neither were the other books in the ark, according to the same passage. Yet, Mr. Greg informs us, they were written between the time of Samuel and Solomon, from 1055 to 1000 B.C. Then why, on his own showing, may not Deuteronomy have been equally early?

The conclusion indicated in this chapter respecting the age of the first four books, we are disposed to admit for the whole Pentateuch, as probably near the truth; but we certainly could not receive that conclusion as one established, for either the whole or a part, by the evidence presented in this volume. We cannot pursue the inquiry as to what is meant by the narrative in 2 Kings xxii. That narrative, it appears to us, has been needlessly raised to importance, as shewing either that the Pentateuch assumed its present form in the time of Josiah, by the addition of the book of Deuteronomy, or that a Book of the Law had not then been previously known. Neither view is warranted by the contents of the chapter; as is sufficiently proved by the fact that the author of the Kings cannot have intended such conclusions to be drawn from the narrative of the discovery; for, at the commencement of the second chapter of the first book, he represents David as charging Solomon to keep the law of Moses, implying the historian's recognition of the existence of the law (Deuteronomy included?) in the time of David.

In reference to the other four books of the Pentateuch, it is quite clear, we are told, not only that they were written long after the time of Moses, but that they are not properly a single consecutive work at all, being only "an imperfect fusion" of two documents "easily discernible throughout." The writer is apparently not certain, however, whether they consist of two documents or two classes of documents (p. 38), although aware that the latter are called, respectively, Elohist and Jehovist. Elohim, he also thinks, being plural in form, "would be more correctly rendered *the Gods*;" from which it follows that the Jews were Polytheists,—this statement being as incorrect as the one which follows it, viz. that Jehovah Elohim means "God of Gods," the rendering probably being either, as in our Common Version, "the Lord God," or else Jehovah God.* The tracing of the documents just referred to, throughout the four books, is by no means so easily accomplished as Mr. Greg seems to suppose. Even "those accustomed to this species of research" differ not slightly from each other as to what is "Elohist" and what is "Jehovist;" and out of Genesis, which has long been recognized by men of various shades of opinion as a compilation from different sources, there is much that is arbitrary and conjectural in the separation of the documents. This, however, is a matter of little importance, and is only mentioned here as an instance of the under-statements or over-statements which occasionally occur in this book, and which, we think, render the writer's treatment of many of the points he dwells on very unsatisfactory.

The Hebrew prophets are particularly unfortunate in the hands of Mr. Greg. We were going to add, that a more entire failure to appreciate the age, office and spirit of these men, we have not met with, but

* Gesenius observes, "*Jehova Deus* (per appositionem, minime, ut nonnulli volebant, *Jehova deorum*, sc. princeps) solennis Jehovæ appellatio," &c. (Lex. man. s. v. Jehova.)

that we observe the terms in which our author, at the close of the chapter, speaks of the prophets, and which we will presently quote. He represents them, without discrimination, as having been "often regarded as madmen;" as in the "frequent habit of going about naked;" and as reminding us too much of the "fanatics of Eastern countries and of ancient times" (p. 54). As to this strange charge of going about "naked," Mr. Greg will find, on consulting the proper authorities, that the word used simply indicates, in some cases, the wearing the mourning garment of sackcloth without the usual tunic, or undergarment, beneath it; in other cases, the wearing merely the undergarment, without either the upper robe or the covering of sackcloth. The "disgusting ceremonies" also attributed to the prophets are, most probably, only symbolical actions, never really performed, but introduced, certainly not with any suitableness to our modern tastes, to give force or definiteness to the written declarations of the prophet.

The author dwells at length on the non-fulfilment of prophecy, understanding by this term the definite prediction of future events; on our uncertainty as to the age of several of the prophets, or the dates at which they wrote; on our ignorance as to who did actually write some portions of the prophetic books, and other matters of this kind; the whole subject being treated throughout in a very depreciatory tone. In thus judging of the prophets by the standard of modern popular misapprehension of what their proper functions were, and appearing so freely to condemn them for not coming up to that standard, he does them manifest injustice. Mr. Greg shews, however, that he can, after all, form a better appreciation of this interesting class of men. At the close of the chapter, as we have intimated, he speaks more justly of them, as "wise, gifted, earnest men, deeply conversant with the past—looking far into the future—shocked with the unrighteousness around them—sagacious to foresee impending evil—bold to denounce spiritual wickedness in high places—imbued, above all, with an unflinching faith, peculiarly strong among their people, that national delinquency and national virtue would alike meet with a temporal and inevitable retribution" (p. 69). This statement we take to be substantially true, but we think it essentially inconsistent with some of the preceding assertions of the same chapter. For example, we are told that "the Jewish writers not only did not scruple to narrate past events as if predicting future ones—to present History in the form of Prophecy—but that they habitually did so" (p. 61). This statement occurs in the chapter headed "The Prophecies," and, in the sense in which the words will be commonly understood, our author brings a weighty charge against the prophets, which he should not have left unexplained, or unsupported by further evidence. Even supposing that, from the character of the documents in which the passages occur to which he appeals in support of that charge, none of those passages can be received as prophecies, properly so called, uttered before the event, still the accusation grounded on them is not proven. All that would really follow is, that it was the custom of Jewish writers to ascribe to historical persons words which were conceived to correspond to the character and circumstances of such persons, to express their motives, and the views which they took of the future. And this, we know, was the practice of the best historians of ancient times.

On the whole, our perusal of the chapter on the Prophets leaves with us the unpleasant feeling that the author is more impressed with unfulfilled predictions, interpolations, spurious chapters, and things of this sort, than with the high moral spirit and monotheistic faith of these remarkable men,—men to whom *we* undoubtedly owe, if not the origin, yet the preservation and a great deal of the development of that religion which has come down to us, and in which Mr. Greg himself recognizes, in some respects, the highest and purest form in which religion has yet been held among men. But now, granting in substance the conclusions which Mr. Greg has adopted from “critical science,” as represented by De Wette, as to the age and composition of many books of the Old Testament, how do these conclusions affect the important position—not sufficiently referred to or acknowledged in this book—that we have in the Hebrew Scriptures the record of God’s earliest provision for the progressive religious instruction of a large portion of the human race? We conceive that that position is left untouched. That the belief in one God gradually struggled into a vigorous existence among the Hebrew people,—that many of their institutions, from the most early times, had a direct reference to the preservation of that fundamental truth,—that the conception of prophets and people were gradually raised and purified by the discipline which Providence appointed for them,—and that, finally, among the Hebrews, and nowhere else in the world, was, and must be, the scene on which Christ should appear, and Christianity commence its career of triumph through the world,—all this is plain enough still, undenied by this book, and not to be refuted, we believe, by any legitimate operations of critical science.

We cannot, within our narrow limits, follow the author into the minutiae of his statements on the subject of the origin of the Gospels. In the main, we think he gives a fair view of what may be said on one side of the question, and of course Mr. Greg is not careful to inform his readers what may be said on the other side. We have, therefore, no sufficient representation in this volume of what the more conservative writers of recent times, English or German, have advanced in defence of the authenticity and credibility, in their great leading features, of the Gospel narratives,—writers, we mean, such as those already mentioned, and others who might be named, not excluding, in reference to St. John, even Bretschneider and De Wette, who are only introduced here as on the purely negative side of the argument. Mr. Greg’s conclusion as to the origin of the first three Gospels is, that they “are compilations from a variety of fragmentary narratives, and reports of discourses and conversations, oral or written, which were current in Palestine from thirty to forty years after the death of Jesus” (p. 94). Now this is not the entire truth. These three Gospels are at least the production, as they stand, each of an individual mind. They embody, indeed, the common traditions and belief of the early church, and to this fact must probably be ascribed much of their verbal agreement with each other. But they are, nevertheless, distinguished from each other by marks of individuality, by characteristics which shew that each writer, whoever he was, did not merely copy or compile, but previously assimilated, as it were, and made his own mental property, the current accounts of his day, oral or written. This implies, of necessity,

a degree of mental effort and earnestness on the part of the writer of each Gospel, shewing that his mind was deeply moved by the facts which he contemplated, and that he would be anxious, therefore, to write what he believed to be the truth. There can be no doubt, again (and it is admitted by Mr. Greg), that the canonical Gospels come down to us from the heart of Christian antiquity, and that they represent the belief of the Christians about the life and character of Jesus, as that belief existed before the destruction of Jerusalem. This is the great consideration for a modern reader, and it is of very secondary importance whether Matthew wrote in Hebrew or in Greek; whether he and the other evangelists were even eye-witnesses or not; whether Irenæus has some silly fancies about the reason of the number of the Gospels (which fancies, however, shew, at all events, that, so early as Irenæus, the four Gospels had long been recognized as the four pillars of the church); whether the same Father, and Papias before him, had strange opinions about the Millennium (which same opinions in no way disqualified them for bearing testimony to a simple matter of fact transmitted to them by others);—all such points as these are of very secondary importance. If, then, the Gospels represent to us the belief of the primitive church respecting the life and character of Jesus, the great question that next presents itself is, how did this deep and earnest belief respecting Jesus—a belief which has endured for eighteen centuries, and which is now deeply rooted in the heart of Christendom—how did this belief respecting Jesus arise, seize upon the multitudes who called themselves by his name, and send them forth in the face of difficulty and danger to evangelize the world? We freely admit that these devoted men carried with them much of intellectual error and some narrow-mindedness—much that was the product of their own personal and national feeling and ways of thinking. But they carried with them also a divine spirit, a vivid sense of the presence and paternal care and love of God, a feeling of the necessity and beauty of a holy life, and a faith in heaven, which—amidst all their misapplication of prophecy (if it be such), their erroneous expectation of the second advent, their belief that the Messiah would yet establish an earthly kingdom, and other such expectations or beliefs—served to perpetuate, down even to this nineteenth century, a religion that is still full of vital power, and expresses and satisfies the moral and spiritual wants and aspirations of the great masses of the most civilized and intelligent nations of the world. We have to account for this great and durable efficiency of the Christian missionaries, as well as for the belief of the primitive church respecting Jesus, from which it sprung, and with which it stands in so intimate a connection. Mr. Greg tells us, in effect, that the belief of the primitive church was, in great part, a mass of error and absurdity; but he leaves the next questions behind it untouched,—the questions, that is to say, how that mass of error and absurdity should have come to exist, and how, having grown up, it should have shewn itself so potent a cause of world-wide, age-enduring and beneficent results. The present author, and others of the anti-supernatural school, appear too much to contemplate Christianity, in its origin and early development, as an isolated section of history, standing at the distance of many centuries from us, and having attained no great and permanent power in the world. Thus separated from the present, as a thing of dead anti-

quity long since passed away, it is thought of and written about as if, in its consequences, it were not a reality still visible to our very eyes in the cities, the villages, the households of half the world. The fact is thus entirely overlooked, that the part which Christianity has played, and still plays, among men is an essential element of its extraordinary character; and that no explanation of its origin which leaves this out of sight, and does not give some reasonable account of it, can be a true one. Admit, however, the representation of the New Testament history, that Jesus was "a man approved of God, by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him," and we have explanation sufficient of all the facts of the case. The wonderful influence obtained by Jesus during his brief career, and in spite of his premature and ignominious death, is accounted for; and the success of his disciples is explained also; for we may easily admit that the same great Being who revealed Himself in the spirit and life of Christ, would not let the cause originated by His chosen Messenger come to nought, but would secure it that degree of efficiency or triumph in the world which He designed it to attain.

Our author, however, enters into particulars to prove that the Gospels cannot be received as trustworthy histories. They contain many errors of various kinds, and other indications which render it impossible to rely upon them. They fill up the "outline of Christ's character and teaching....with much that is not authentic," and many of their statements "are not historical, but mystical or legendary" (p. 151). We cannot pretend here to examine all the instances adduced as justifying this estimate of the evangelical narratives; but we may observe, that many of those instances will not bear the test of careful and fair examination. We are aware, however, that it is not well to make a general assertion to this effect without giving examples in proof. We will, therefore, offer one or two, chiefly for the purpose of illustrating what we mean.

In order to justify a general "want of confidence in Matthew's fidelity," Mr. Greg brings forward, among others, the following example of the liberty which that evangelist has taken "with both fact and probability." Matthew, we are told, in order to shew the literal fulfilment in Christ of Zechariah ix. 9, represents Jesus (Matt. xxi. 2—4, 6, 7) as sitting on the two animals, the ass and its colt; and not only so, but in so doing he misunderstood the words of Zechariah, who speaks of only one animal, "an ass, *even* a colt, the foal of an ass." That Matthew misunderstood the prophecy to mean and to require *two* animals is, however, by no means clear; for why may not his quotation (xxi. 5) of the prophet's words be rendered, "riding upon an ass, *even* a colt, the foal of an ass"? But why, then, does the evangelist represent two animals as having been brought? Simply because the colt was with its mother, and would be followed by the latter. That Mark, Luke and John, as Mr. Greg observes, only mention the colt, merely shews that they left out of their narratives the incident of the mother being with the younger animal. But, again alleges our author, "the description (ver. 7) representing Jesus as sitting on both animals is absurd." Does it, then, represent him as sitting on *both*? We believe not, because the second *ἐπ' αὐτῶν* may as well refer to the *ἵμῃα* as to the animals. If this explanation

be thought too elaborate or artificial, we may admit that the evangelist, having mentioned two animals, states in a loose way that the disciples placed the garments "on them," appearing to include both, when he really meant only one, and in his brevity not caring to discriminate between them. The same explanation evidently applies to the following *επανω αυτων*, if these words be understood of the animals. It seems incredible, on the face of the matter, that any man who could write at all, and who had any reverence for Jesus, should really intend to make the statement Mr. Greg attributes to him. We must add, that we should have thought it equally incredible that the author of "*The Creed of Christendom*" should have put such a construction on the evangelist's language, did not the fact lie so plainly before us.

Again, our author, in order to shew "the confusion of mind which characterizes" the same evangelist, brings forward the passage (xxiii. 35) in which Jesus is represented as speaking of "the blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias." Two persons of this name, Mr. Greg informs us, were slain, one 850 years B. C. (2 Chron. xxiv. 20); the other, mentioned by Josephus, thirty-five years after Christ's death; and as Jesus could not have intended to refer to a murder committed 850 years before his time as terminating the series of Jewish crimes, the Zacharias mentioned by Josephus must be the one alluded to in the passage in the Gospel. Hence Matthew evidently represents Jesus "as speaking in the past tense of an event which did not occur till thirty-five years after his death." Thus "he was guilty of putting into the mouth of Jesus words which Jesus never uttered" (pp. 115—117). Now this seems, at first sight, to be a very clear case; yet the answer and explanation are equally clear and easy. The Second Book of Chronicles closes the Jewish canon of the Old Testament; and in speaking of the series of crimes from Abel to the Zacharias in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, Jesus no doubt meant to include all such crimes mentioned in the Old Testament history, from the beginning to the end, from the commencement of the canon to its close,—as we should say, from Genesis to Revelation. There is thus no good reason, much less necessity, for supposing that the Zacharias of Josephus was the one in the mind of Matthew, in the words referred to. As to the difference of names—"son of Barachias" in Matthew, as compared with "son of Jehoiada" in Chronicles—that, too, is capable of as easy an explanation.

We could multiply instances of this kind of misinterpretation on the part of our author, and shew that he exaggerates the importance of this sort of proof of the unhistorical character of the Gospels and the incapacity of their writers. We believe that the majority of instances which he brings forward are really, when carefully investigated and rightly interpreted, on the side of the credibility of the evangelical statements. We again, therefore, warn the candid reader against taking the assertions of this book, on such matters, without further examination. Some of the particulars adduced, we are free to confess, will bear the construction Mr. Greg puts upon them. And this admission is rendered necessary and easy by the consideration of the sources from which the Gospel narratives were probably drawn.

Mr. Greg, however, himself (with great inconsistency, as we submit) allows (p. 151) and re-asserts (p. 160) that the synoptical Gospels "give a fair and faithful outline of Christ's character and teaching." And, admitting this much, we ask, was it not to be expected that, around so extraordinary a character as that of Christ, some statements not strictly historical, some with, perhaps, a basis of fact which we cannot now satisfactorily reach, and some even of an altogether fictitious nature, should collect themselves? In connection with the early portion of the life of Christ—that part of it which lay far distant from the time when anything would be *written* concerning him, or when he had even begun to attract notice as a remarkable man—in connection with the infancy and childhood of Jesus, may not this question be especially asked? It would be contrary to the nature of things and to human nature that such a result should not have taken place. Nothing but a miracle of the most extraordinary kind could have prevented it. Let, therefore, "critical science," in a fair spirit, do its work of separating the "not authentic," the "mystical and legendary," from the properly historical contents of the Gospels. When it has done so, we believe that enough will still be left on which to found the belief in Christ, his life and teachings, as the author of a revelation from God to man.

(To be continued.)

LINES ON READING SOME RECENT REVIEWS OF THE WORKS OF UNBELIEVERS.

AND is it all a dream,—this firm-built faith
 In what the Prophets and the Teacher saith?
 Was there no vision, no inspiring power,
 To rouse the soul in trouble's perilous hour?
 No voice from God, no light and warmth within,
 To guide and bless and sanctify from sin?

Where shines a life of love so full and free?
 A dream—a fantasy! it cannot be;
 With gladness welcomed and with reverence heard,
 The stamp of truth is on the Saviour's word;
 The sense enraptured listens to the sound,
 For life and healing in that word is found.

Ye sophists! madly vain! take all away,
 But leave me Him to point my heavenward way;
 Cast down the idols that my heart adored
 When young ambition had to angel's soar'd,—
 The will to reign, though darkness round should lower,
 The pride of knowledge, and the lust of power,—
 Take all,—a cheerful sacrifice they seem,
 Should but the light from Christ around me beam.

Lonely I meditate of death's dread doom,—
 No power to rouse the silence of the tomb;
 Virtue a breath that in the uttering dies,—
 And folly all the holiest sanctities;
 Truth, justice, mercy, love of human kind,
 But vain pretence,—the blind that lead the blind;

Self-love subdued, and social love her throne
 In the heart's palace as her native zone :
 'Tis but a mythic tale of elder time,
 The mist that magnifies the false sublime.

Such doubts away! Ye are but tempting forms
 To veil the ruin left by passion's storms ;
 In truth's bright sunshine graceless and defiled,
 A yawning death alone upon you smiled,—
 Hideous to sight—the rattling bones unclothed,
 Save with the slimy worms by nature loathed.

Are ye the rivals of the eternal grace
 That beamed resplendent in the Saviour's face?
 Are ye the lords of destiny, to sway
 Immortal souls to tread the downward way?
 Grasp'd in your giant-might, as serpent's twine,
 To crush in agonies the light divine ;
 Recoiling yet imprisoned, must we see
 Our faith a mangled corse that struggled to be free?

Fold upon fold, her form ye bind around,
 She gasps and faints and sinks upon the ground ;
 The soul's bright fountains mists and darkness seize,
 And icy terrors every feeling freeze ;
 There is no sound nor motion,—not a breath,
 But all the fearful rigidity of death.
 Whom once we loved is gone ; the heart must know
 The burning fierceness of this night of woe ;
 No hope, no mercy,—vengeance only reigns,
 And the destroyer triumphs in our pains.

O God! thou Good Supreme! some token give
 That yet our fainting faith will rise and live ;
 Touch with thy fire each faculty to feel
 Thou wilt the long'd-for mercy yet reveal ;
 Call to some master-spirit of mankind,
 And clear the darkness from the doubting mind ;
 Restore as at the first the word divine,
 And truth's own glories bid around it shine,
 Pure and yet lasting, as some star-world strong,
 Through orbs of light to bear the soul along,
 Till it hath reach'd the angel-guarded strand,
 And heard the welcome of the undying band :

“ Brother! the clouds are gone ; look forth and see
 The mirror of God's truth from blemish free ;
 Untarnish'd there the glorious promise shines,
 And beams upon us in immortal lines ;
 The day-dawn of eternal grace is come,
 And, trials pass'd, the weary find a home ;
 The temple God hath built the nations throng,—
 Mercy their theme,—redemption's love their song ;
 No change, no death,—eternal ages roll,
 Nor doubt nor fear disturb the trusting soul.”

May 10th, 1851.

F. S. C.

THE BLACKMORE PAPERS. No. I.

WE have been permitted by Mrs. Aspinall Turner, one of the descendants of William Blackmore, the ejected minister of St. Peter's, Cornhill, London, to inspect a series of letters and other family papers, which throw some light on the domestic manners and religious history of England in the 17th and 18th centuries. We propose to print for the benefit of our readers a selection from these documents, and to give some account of those members of the Blackmore family who devoted themselves in three successive generations to the ministerial office.

REV. WILLIAM BLACKMORE

was the son of a citizen of London bearing the same name, descended from a respectable family in the county of Essex. William Blackmore, of London, was a member of the Fishmongers' Company, and had two sons. John,* the elder, appears to have devoted himself to public employments, attained to knighthood, and was in the confidence of the Protector, Oliver Cromwell. On the Restoration, he went out to St. Helena as governor of the island. A picture of him, which is preserved in the house of a descendant in Yorkshire, represents a man of tall and noble figure, with long dark hair, equipped in a complete suit of armour. It is probable that he served during the civil war on the side of the Parliament. He lived to the age of 80, and died at St. Helena in consequence of a fall from his horse. The names of his two sons indicated his Puritanic bias, the elder being Francis Serve-God, and the younger Lemuel. Francis S. Blackmore died before Nov. 15, 1697, in the parish of Clarendon, in the island of Jamaica, where he was possessed of an estate. Lemuel Blackmore survived his brother Francis. He was in the East-India Company's service, and was shipwrecked and drowned on his voyage to Jamaica,† whither he was going to take possession of the estate left him by his brother's will.

William Blackmore the younger was brought up for the ministerial calling. His parents, we may presume, were, in common with a large proportion of the citizens of London at that period, moderate Puritans. They belonged to the Church of England, but did not sympathize with the Arminian doctrines and ceremonious ritual favoured by Archbishop Laud. Of the precise period of William Blackmore's birth we are not informed. At the proper age he was entered a member of Lincoln College, Oxford, and in due time, according to Calamy (*Continuation*, I. 43), he took his Master's degree. Of his companions at Lincoln College we know nothing. Early in the century, the College, according to Tanner, occupied in numbers a middle rank, having a rector, twelve fellows, 60 commoners and 36 poor scholars. William Blackmore was probably a commoner. It is remarkable that Anthony Wood makes no mention of him in his *Fasti*. To authorship he made so little pretension, that it is not strange that his name has no place in the *Athenæ Oxonienses*.

Calamy informs us that Mr. Blackmore was "ordained Deacon by Bishop Prideaux, Rector of Lincoln and Bishop of Worcester." If, as

* There was a Major John Blackmore Member for Tiverton in Cromwell's Parliament, 1654, but he was of a Devonshire family.

† He was in Sir Cloudesley Shovel's own ship, the *Association*, and perished, with every person on board, by striking upon the rocks of Scilly. See an account of the Admiral in Smollett's *History*, Vol. II. p. 120.

is probable, he meant by this statement, Rector of Lincoln College, and further, if the statement were correct, it would at once explain what took the young candidate for orders into the diocese of Worcester. But from Wood we learn that Prideaux was Rector, not of Lincoln, but of Exeter College. To this College, as Prince expressly states in his *Worthies of Devon*, he betook himself, as that wherein most of his countrymen (Devonians) resided. Here the energetic youth fought his way up from the meanest and most servile, to the highest and most honoured post. But besides being Rector of Exeter College, he was appointed, in 1615, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University. In the discharge of this important office he acquired an European reputation; he was the correspondent of Casaubon; and his instructions were resorted to by foreigners of learning and rank. William Blackmore was doubtless one of his pupils in divinity. This is Anthony Wood's character of Prideaux as a Professor in Theology: "In his lectures, disputes and moderatings (which were always frequented with many auditors), he shewed himself a stout champion against Socinus and Arminius." Within the walls of a neighbouring college, Magdalen Hall, John Biddle, a contemporary of Blackmore, was a student, and there began he that course of profound theological study, "determined" (as his biographer states) "more by reason than authority," which ended in his becoming the Father of English Unitarianism. Mr. Blackmore, we shall presently see, with more docility, followed faithfully enough the footsteps of his theological Professor, preserving to the last his Calvinism, and on one occasion at least testifying his horror of Socinianism. Wood further describes Prideaux as "a plentiful fountain of all sorts of learning, an excellent linguist, a person of a prodigious memory, and so profound a divine, that they have been pleased to entitle him *Columna fidei orthodoxæ et malleus hæresecus*." The period during which William Blackmore studied at Oxford was ominous of the approaching storm which levelled the throne, and at one time threatened destruction to the ancient seats of English learning and to the institution of parochial clergy.* He had left the University before the erection there, in 1648, of Presbyterian discipline. In common with the great majority of his associates there, it is probable that, notwithstanding his Presbyterian predilections, he was not without feelings of personal loyalty to Charles the First. From the Tanner MSS. (in the Bod. Lib.) it appears that Lincoln College, on the breaking out of the war, sent its silver plate, weighing 47 lbs. 2 oz. 5 dwts., to be coined at the mint in New Inn Hall for the King's service. Although the contribution was smaller than that of the other colleges (except Balliol), it was probably their all.

* In the Barebones Parliament the question was put, whether all parish ministers should not at once be put down through the nation, and the proposal was rejected by a simple majority of two votes. (Baxter's Life, Part i. p. 70.) Of the danger in which the Universities were from the enthusiasm of William Dell and William Erbury,—men who, with a wonderfully clear perception of some great principles and truths, little appreciated by the mass of their contemporaries, on other matters were open to the charge of gross fanaticism,—a very interesting account is given by Godwin in his *History of the Commonwealth*, IV. Cap. viii. A life of Erbury, one of the early Unitarians of England, is a desideratum in ecclesiastical history. We have some interesting materials on the subject, which we may hereafter put together in this Magazine.

As Dr. John Prideaux was not consecrated Bishop of Worcester till the close of 1641, Wm. Blackmore could not be ordained Deacon before 1642. As we find Mr. Blackmore's name from the first in the Register Book of the fourth Presbyterian Classis of London, which assembled, in obedience to the ordinance of Parliament, in the autumn of 1645, we may conclude that immediately or soon after his ordination Mr. Blackmore commenced his ministry at St. Peter's, Cornhill. He would be in the first instance curate or assistant minister. The minister holding the place of the Rector was a man of rare Oriental learning, and scarcely less rare moderation of spirit,—Thomas Coleman, sometimes, from his Hebrew lore, styled *Rabbi Coleman*, a member of the Westminster Assembly and a friend of the illustrious Selden. The living was previously held by Dr. William Fairfax, who in August, 1643, was dispossessed on account of the scandal of his life, and his name is included by White in his *Century of Scandalous Ministers*, the charges against him, besides drunkenness and other immorality, being his refusal to administer the sacrament but at the rails, his refusal to admit lecturers, and his charging Parliament with being the cause of all the troubles and disturbances in the kingdom. Coleman was equally opposed to Prelacy and Presbyterianism, and voted in the Assembly with the Erastian party. This may have been the reason of his taking no part in the early proceedings of the fourth Classis, which began to assemble a little time before his death. Mr. Blackmore had no scruples, notwithstanding his Episcopal ordination, in the way of conformity to the Presbyterian discipline. Indeed, Calamy states that he afterwards received Classical ordination. This statement we are able to confirm, and to illustrate from the minutes of the fourth Classis. The first ordination held by the ministers was on April 20, 1647, at the church of Mary-Hill. On the previous day the Classis met, and the following entry appears: "Mr. Blackmore, one of this Classis not fully in orders, being well known and approved of by all the ministers of this Classis, had this thesis given him—*An cuique competat ex officio prædicare, competat sacramenta administrare*. And to bring in the same to-morrow." On the following day, accordingly, he brought in the required thesis. The preliminaries required from the other candidates—such as testimony to his age, character, previous studies, call to the ministry by some congregation, or employment as chaplain, and the having taken the Solemn League and Covenant—were in the case of Mr. Blackmore dispensed with. The service began with a prayer from Mr. Hall, the minister of "Buttolph, Billingsgate." Mr. Wall, minister of Michael, Cornhill, preached. The ordainers were Mr. Ley, Mr. Roborough, and five others. Mr. Ley and Mr. Harrison put the usual questions to the candidates for ordination and offered the prayer, when the ceremony of imposition of hands was completed. Mr. Blackmore's name is inscribed first of the sixteen who on this occasion received ordination. The ceremony concluded with an exhortation and prayer from Mr. Ley.*

* Rev. John Ley is designated by Wood "one of the pillars of Presbytery." He was, before the times of Presbytery, Sub-Dean of Chester. He sat in the Assembly, and was Chairman of the Committee in Cheshire for the examination of ministers. From his pen proceeded the notable declaration of Presbyterian orthodoxy and intolerance issued by the Cheshire ministers in 1648, under the

Coleman died in March, 1647, and the Westminster Assembly did honour to his virtue and learning by following his remains to the grave. It is somewhat singular that the formal presentation of Mr. Blackmore to the Rectory of St. Peter's did not take place till 1656. This is certain from the following document, endorsed in Mr. Blackmore's autograph,

"Copy of my Presentation.

"Wee the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London, true and undoubted Patrons of the Rectory or Parish Church of Peter's, Cornhill, London, doe hereby present to the hono^{ble} Commissioners for approbation of Publique Preachers, William Blackmore, Clerke, Master of Arts, to the said Rectory and Church, now being vacant by the death of William Fairfax, Doctor in Divinity, and the late Incumbent there, and in full right belonging to our presentation and disposition, desiring y^e said Com^{rs} to admit the said William Blackmore to the said Parish Church, and to institute and invest him Rector in and to the same, with all the rights and appurtenances. And that they will with favour doe and fulfill all other things which in this behalfe appertain to be done. In witness whereof wee have caused the Common Seal of the said City to be put to these presents. Dated at London, y^e thirteenth day of May, One Thousand Six Hundred Fifty and Six.*

"A true Copy.—Jo. NYE, Reg^r."

It would appear from this that Dr. Fairfax, though sequestered, had been regarded to the close of his life as at least the nominal incumbent.

The church of St. Peter's, in which William Blackmore officiated not less, probably, than twenty years, stood in the very heart of the city of London, near the southern corner of Cornhill, and in the 17th century was frequented by a large congregation, composed mainly of substantial citizens, who had not then ceased to dwell under the roof which covered their shop, warehouse or counting-house. It was a fine old building. The distinction was once claimed for it of being the most ancient church in Great Britain, and of having been founded by Lucius, the first Christian king of England, who is said to have established at the same time an Archbishop's see, and to have made this the Metropolitan church.

title, "An Attestation to the Testimony of our Reverend Brethren of the Province of London to the Truth of Jesus Christ and to our Solemn League and Covenant, as also against the Errours, Heresies and Blasphemies of these Times, and the Toleration of them." 4to, pp. 56. He died May 16, 1662, and holding much valuable Church preferment (which was by contemporaries imputed to him as a fault), and thus escaped the test of sincerity which the following Bartholomew's-day imposed. Of the fifty-nine ministers who signed the Cheshire Attestation, only about one-seventh were Bartholomean confessors. Some were, however, like Mr. Ley, deceased.

* Mr. Hunter has drawn our attention to the following extract from the Books of the Committee for Plundered Ministers, under the date June 27, 1646:—"Whereas the Rectory of Peter's in Cornhill, London, was sequestered from Dr. Fairfax to the use of Mr. Coleman, a member of the Assembly of Divines, since deceased, it is ordered that the said Rectory shall from henceforth stand sequestered to the use of William Blackmore," &c. If this date be correct, our date of Coleman's death, which we have taken from Brooks's *Lives of the Puritans*, is wrong. Mr. Hunter supposes that William Blackmore sought to strengthen his title by a presentation from the lawful patrons on the death of Dr. Fairfax.

But the whole story, including the existence of King Lucius, is somewhat mythical. The patronage of the church was once in the hands of the Neville family, but in 1411 it was conveyed by Richard Whittington and others to the Lord Mayor and Commonalty of the city of London, in whom the advowson still remains. The edifice in which William Blackmore preached was destroyed, together with 88 other churches, and 400 streets and 13,000 houses,* in the great fire of 1666.

That Mr. Blackmore was a zealous and successful minister may be concluded both from the testimony of his contemporaries and from the manuscript remains of his pulpit labours. Unlike many of the contemporary ministers, he gave but little to the press, and that little appeared without his name. But he was styled by Calamy in his "Account" (II. 35), "a considerable man," and in his "Continuation" he adds, "he was accounted a person of moderation, great prudence, and a peace-maker." He devoted himself especially to the religious instruction of the young of his parish, and his catechetical instructions were particularly useful. The mode of catechising was strictly prescribed by the Provincial Assembly. The ministers were to give public notice of their intention to catechise, and at the same time were enjoined in their discourse to admonish parents to instruct their children in the Catechism at home, that they might be prepared to give their answers readily and cheerfully in public. The only Catechism allowed was the Assembly's Lesser Catechism, and it was alleged as a reason why this excelled all other Catechisms, that "every answer is a perfect proposition without the question." The hour of catechising was immediately before the afternoon's service, it being expected that the whole congregation would attend and benefit thereby. The minister was on the first going over the Catechism to give brief explanations, and it was expected that by this plan the people would "in a short time have a taste of the whole body of divinity." Not merely children, but servants, not yet admitted to the Lord's table by the ruling elders, were to be catechised. That none might through poverty be excluded, Catechisms were to be purchased at the expense of each parish, and distributed at the discretion of the minister.†

* Pepys, in his Diary, Sept. 2, 1666, says, "We saw the fire as only one entire arch of fire * * above a mile long; it made me weep to see it. The churches, houses, and all on fire, and flaming at once." Sept. 5: "I walked into the town, and find Fenchurch Street, Gracious Street and Lombard Street, all in dust. The Exchange a sad sight." Mr. Evelyn saw on the night of Sept. 3, "the whole south part of the city burning from Cheapside to the Thames, and all along Cornhill," and says it "burnt both in breadth and length the churches," &c. On Sept. 7, he passed through Cornhill with extraordinary difficulty, clambering over heaps of yet smoking rubbish, and frequently mistaking where he was.

† The substance of this statement is taken from the Minute Book of the Fourth Classis, pp. 90, 91. It appears that the Provincial Assembly at which the resolutions were passed was held Nov. 23, 1648. This date shews the inaccuracy of a statement by Neal in his History of the Puritans (IV. 133), to the effect that the recommendation of catechising and the regulations concerning it were occasioned by the publication of Mr. Biddle's two Catechisms. Biddle's "Two-fold Catechism" was not published till 1654. The Assembly's Catechism was authorized to be printed for public use by a vote of the House of Commons, Sept. 15, 1648. There is the strongest internal evidence of Biddle's intending his Catechisms as a reply to those put out by the Assembly. In his Preface he speaks

From the minutes of the fourth Classis of the London Presbytery, which are fortunately preserved in the Blackmore papers, and which are now before the writer, it appears that he was amongst the most assiduous in carrying out Presbyterian discipline in London. During the thirteen years which the Classis existed, from 1646 to 1659, his name is found at nearly all the meetings, which were usually held every fortnight, and sometimes more frequently. In reward for his assiduity he was in 1648 returned by the Classis as one of the three ministerial delegates to the Provincial Assembly, and by that body he was appointed to the honourable office of *Scribe* or Secretary.

Presbyterian government, as set up in London and Lancashire, was administered by means of teachers and pastors who were regularly ordained, and of lay elders, sometimes called ruling elders. A certain number of contiguous parishes constituted a Classis. Thus the fourth Classis was composed of the following

<i>Parishes</i>	<i>Ministers.</i>
Andrew Hubbert*	William Wickins.
Bennet, Gracechurch	William Harrison.
Buttolph, Billingsgate	— Hall.
Dionis, Backchurch	— Hardy.
Clemens, Eastcheap	— Taylor.
George, Buttolph Lane	— Henschman.
Leonards, Eastcheap	Henry Roborough.
Magnus	Joseph Caryll.
Margaret, New Fish Street	Mr. Fraizell.
Martin Orgars	—
Mary Hill	John Ley.
Michael, Crooked Lane	Mr. Browne.
Michael, Cornhill	John Wall.
Peter's, Cornhill	William Blackmore.

To the Classis were referred all questions respecting the ministers and elders of the several churches composing it, and on them devolved the examination and ordination of candidates for the ministry, and as the Presbyterian discipline did not exist in other parts of the country, the candidates were sometimes numerous, coming from most counties of England. Another essential element of Presbyterian government was the Provincial Assembly, composed of delegates from both ministers and lay elders of each Classis. To this body, which met generally in Sion College, were referred all matters of general discipline, and the preservation of public morals and faith.†

The perusal of the minutes of a Presbyterian Classis will probably

of "Assemblies of Divines justling the sacred writers out of their place in the church." Mr. Neal has given very correctly (IV. 133) the directions of the Provincial Assembly, which were signed by Dr. Calamy as Moderator, and by William Harrison and William Blackmore, Scribes; but the document wants the date. Hence the error into which he has fallen of supposing the Catechism of the Assembly to be the effect (instead of the cause) of Biddle's. Mr. Neal has also (p. 134) wrongly given 1651 as the date of Biddle's work.

* The orthography is that of the Class Register.

† For a full description of Presbyterian discipline, the curious reader may be referred to Dr. Hibbert Ware's *History of the Collegiate Church of Manchester*, Chap. xviii.

not exalt the reader's idea of the advantages of this form of church government. Sometimes he will find the attention of the learned and religious body directed to matters of a very trifling and frivolous character; at others, he will see unequivocal proofs of spiritual despotism on the part of the assembled Presbyters. The abhorrence of Prelacy was not always founded on any enlarged view and love of religious liberty. The conduct of some of the Presbyterian leaders exposed them too truly to Milton's charge, that they "envied, not abhorr'd," Prelatic power. Indignantly he asked,

"Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword,
To force our consciences that Christ set free,
And ride us with a classick hierarchy?"

The religious history of England in the period that immediately succeeded the downfall of the Church of England, affords too many proofs that

"New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large."

A few passages, taken almost at random from the "Register Booke," will justify these remarks, as well as in all probability satisfy our readers' curiosity.

"Dec. 22, 1646, thanks are given to Mr. Mould for procuring justice to be done on certain profaners of the Sabbath by fawn-hunting." Sometimes, as has been intimated, the proceedings of the Classis partook of an inquisitorial character. Thus, Jan. 18, 1646, we read,—“Whereas the parish of Michael, Cornhill, sent unto the Classis, Dec. 7, 1646, to desire their advice concerning the admission of Mr. Symonds to the expository lecture there: And whereas that then upon good grounds they resolved to defer the final determination concerning the matter till they were satisfied he was orthodox in judgment,

“They now resolve,—

“That notwithstanding some information from very good hands concerning Mr. Symonds' opinion for toleration of diversities of religions, Poperie not excepted, having now received by way of answer from his own mouth, made to such as were sent from the Classis to confer with him about it, that he disavoweth that opinion, and avoweth that he hath preached the contrary doctrine this last summer, when the same shall be testified under his hand to the Classis, they are willing to give advice to the parish of Michael, Cornhill, to admitt him to preach the expository lecture in the said church as Mr. Burroughs lately did.”

Mr. Symonds, the subject of these proceedings on the part of the fourth Classis, was at one time beneficed at Sandwich, in Kent. He was during the civil war chaplain to Sir Thomas Fairfax. He was afterwards appointed by the Parliament one of the Welsh preachers, and appears to have been Independent in respect to church discipline, and to have been opposed to infant baptism. He is placed by Edwards in the Gallery of Heretics portrayed in the Gangræna. In the third Part, which is exceedingly rare, of that calumnious work, the following description occurs: “There is one Mr. Symonds, a great sectary, who came to London since the wars and preached at little All-Hallows, Thames Street, and at the Tower, where I have been informed that he hath preached several strange things; as for *toleration* and liberty for all men to worship God according to their consciences, and in favour of *antipædobaptism*. Also, preaching once at Andrew's Undershaft for

Mr. Goodwin, he preached high strains of antinomianism; as that Christ was a legal preacher, and lived in a dark time, and so preached the law, but afterwards the gospel came to be preached. Afterwards, preaching at Lawrence Poultney on the day of thanksgiving for taking Sherborne Castle, he spake of the great victories the saints, meaning the Independents, had obtained; and yet the Parliament was now making laws against those saints. As at London he hath preached thus, so since he left London, this last summer, he preached at Bath before the General strange stuff, viz., against Presbytery, saying it was a limb of Antichrist, pleading for liberty of conscience, and for those who would not have their children baptized till they came to years of understanding, and for weavers and ignorant mechanics preaching; when he spake of these men's gifts and their having the Spirit before learned men and men bred at universities, with a great deal of this stuff."—Part III. pp. 242, 243.

April 5, 1647, the Classis unite in a petition to the House of Commons praying for the effectual establishment of an uniform Presbyterian discipline, which they regard as necessary to resist "a most dangerous inundation of horrid blasphemies, damnable heresies and abominable prophaneness, daily increasing over the whole kingdom, all which cry aloud for the speediest and most effectual application of the remedy of church government."

April 12, 1647, an ordination was held; testimonials are produced of Mr. Joseph Crabb's having taken the national covenant, being an "orthodox" divine, and having always firmly adhered to the Parliament's cause, wherefore the subscribers (amongst whom are the names of John White, Robert Tachin and John Goodwin) "judge him fit to take the charge of souls." Testimonials are also produced in his favour from the people of Beamister, who desired his services, and from the standing Committee for the county of Dorset. A subject was assigned to the candidate to preach on; in Mr. Crabb's case it was, "An liceat Christianis bellum gerere?"

July 19, 1647. "The Classis taking notice that divers malignant ministers have of late preached within the said Classis, and the Common Prayer Book read, contrary to an ordinance of Parliament in that behalf,—Voted, That notice be given to the several parishes within the said Classis, that they request the minister and elders of each parish to take all care possible that the Common Prayer Book, or any part thereof, be not used therein, in affront of Parliament, contempt of their ordinance, disturbance of the Government by authority of both Houses established."

It is matter of history that the power of the Presbyterian party, and especially of the ministers, was curbed and thwarted by a combination of the Independents and the secret favourers of the Church of England. The aim of the Presbyterian clergy to establish a system of spiritual discipline entirely independent of and superior to the province of the civil magistrate, was happily frustrated. They viewed with scorn and hatred the principle of toleration, in upholding which persons of a great variety of opinions, Arminians, Independents, Antinomians, Baptists and others, cordially agreed. In 1646, Thomas Edwards, the minister of Christ's Church, London, published his *Gangræna*, being a catalogue of heresies and living heretics, designed to expose to public reprobation the consequences of that toleration, claimed by so many, and to some extent of necessity conceded. This singular work, one of the most vio-

lent and discreditable specimens of odium theologicum which even that age produced, is now seldom quoted by writers of any party without reprobation of its bad spirit. It was at the time of its publication objected to by some, as Mr. Baxter tells us, as "nothing but lies;" but it is certain that its appearance was hailed by the Presbyterian clergy generally with satisfaction. Even Baxter himself, in his "Scripture Proof of Infant Baptism,"* justified Edwards's general statements. Towards the close of the year following the publication of the "Gangræna," the principal Presbyterian ministers of London, and amongst them, we regret to say, William Blackmore, united to publish, attested by their names, a document drawn up in the spirit of Edwards's book, and designed to promote the same object. This is entitled, "A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ and to our Solemn League and Covenant; as also against the Errors, Heresies and Blasphemies of these Times, and the Toleration of them; wherein is inserted a Catalogue of divers of the said Errors," &c. Mr. Neal, in his account of the "Testimony," states that it was agreed to by the ministers not at their Provincial Assembly, but at a weekly meeting held at Sion College, where, *since they could do no more*, they agreed to bear their public testimony to the errors of the times. Besides being a very curious exhibition of the religious temper of the times, this rare pamphlet is valuable as containing a few fragments, all that is now known to remain, of some of the heretical books of Paul Best, burnt by the hands of the common hangman. A single passage is all we can now find room for: "A publicke and generall Toleration will prove an hideous and complexive evil of most dangerous and mischievous consequence, if ever, which God forbid, it shall be consented to by authority, for hereby the glory of the Most High God will be laid in the very dust; the truth of Christ, yea, all the fundamentals of faith, will be razed to the ground. * * * England shall be swallowed up with sects, schisms, divisions, disorders, contentions and confusions, and become an odious sink and common receptacle of all the prodigious errours, lies, heresies, blasphemies, libertinism and prophanenesses in the world, so that Rome itself shall not be a more odious puddle and cage of all abominations and uncleanness. The godly shall sit down and lament us. * * * All the reformed churches shall be ashamed to own us. They shall all cry out against us, *Is this England, that covenanted and swore to the Most High God to endeavour such a reformation and extirpation of Popery, Prelacie, superstition, heresie, schisme, prophanenesse, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness*; and after so long travail hath she now brought forth an hideous Monster of Toleration? * * * Therefore we, the ministers of Jesus Christ, do hereby testifie to all our flocks, to all the kingdom, and to all the reformed churches, as our great dislike of Prelacie, Erastianisme, Brownisme and Independency, so our utter abhorrency of *Antiscripturisme, Popery, Arrianisme, Socinianisme, Arminianisme, Anabaptisme, Libertinisme and Familisme*, with all such like, now *too rife amongst us*, and that we detest the fore-mentioned

* In this strange work, perhaps the least creditable of Baxter's voluminous writings, the Baptists are charged with breaking, by their practice of baptism, both the 6th and 7th Commandments! Well might Southey say the charge was an "absurd calumny."

Toleration, so much pursued and endeavoured in this kingdom, accounting it unlawful and pernicious."

Three years before the publication of this intolerant manifesto, Milton had, in that masterpiece of his prose writings, the *Areopagitica*, confuted and rebuked the "irrational men" who, under the influence of "fantastic terrors," "would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms," and made it a calamity that any man dissented from their maxims. It was clear that the Presbyterian clergy of 1647 could not be safely trusted with the religious liberty of the people of England. They had yet to learn its first principle. Happily, they did afterwards learn it; but it was only in that school whence have come forth Paul and Milton and Jeremy Taylor and Locke, and all the great defenders of religious liberty, the *school of persecution*.

It appears from the "Register Booke" that the Classis chose each half-year delegates to represent them in the Provincial Assembly. The choice of the fourth Classis fell more than once on William Blackmore, and on one occasion at least he was by that Assembly appointed Scribe. It was in connection with the Assembly that he appeared as an author in print. In order to forward the work of church government by Presbyteries, which met with no little opposition from both the Independents and the Erastians, a work was put out on the 1st of December, 1646, entitled, "*Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, or the Divine Right of Church Government asserted and evidenced by the Holy Scriptures." The portion of this work which related to ordination was assigned to and executed by William Blackmore. The writer has failed in his attempts to see this work, and must content himself with mentioning the opinions of others respecting it. Robert Baillie, the Scottish Presbyterian, who was then in London, thus notices its appearance: "The ministers of London have put out this day a *very fine book*, proving from scripture the divine right of every part of the Presbyterian government." (Baillie's Journal and Letters, Vol. II. p. 411.) And a modern writer, Rev. W. M. Hetherington, describes it as "the most complete and able defence of Presbyterian church government that has yet appeared, and places its divine right on a foundation which will not easily be shaken." (History of the Westminster Assembly, p. 288.) Mr. Hanbury, on the other hand, in his "Historical Memorials relating to Independents" (III. 219), speaks contemptuously of the "*Jus Divinum*," and accuses the authors of it of "falsification" in their statement of the nine points of contrast between Independency and Presbyterianism.

Mr. Blackmore was again delegated to the Provincial Assembly in April, 1649. On the last day of their session, Nov. 2, this body agreed to "A Vindication of the Presbyterianial Government and Ministry," which was published the following year. It is not probable that Mr. Blackmore had any personal share in the composition of this work, as it is subscribed by the names of George Walker, *Moderator*; Arthur Jackson and Edmund Calamy, *Assessors*; Roger Drake and Elidad Blackwell, *Scribes*. But as it is highly probable that its arguments were similar to those put forth in the "*Jus Divinum*," we will enumerate the points essayed to be proved in the "Vindication" by the Provincial Assembly. 1. That there is a church government by divine right. 2. That the magistrate is not the fountain of church government.

3. That the Presbyterian government is by divine right. 4. That the congregational discipline is inconvenient. 5. That the ruling elder is by divine right. 6. That it is the will of Jesus Christ that all sorts of persons should give an account of their faith to the minister and elders before admission to the Lord's Supper. 7. That separation from Presbyterian churches is justly charged with schism. 8. That ministers formerly ordained by Bishops need no new ordaining.—The mere enumeration of these Presbyterian theses shews the fulfilment of Milton's prophecy in 1644, "Soon will it be put out of controversy that Bishops and Presbyters are the same to us both in name and thing;" and justifies the statement of Ludlow in his *Memoirs*, that some of his contemporaries "were contented to sacrifice all civil liberties to the ambition of the Presbyterian clergy, and to vest them with a power as great or greater than that which had been declared intolerable in the Bishops before."

The progress of Independency and the ascendancy of Cromwell were viewed by the Presbyterian party with pain and dismay. Over the citizens of London the Presbyterian clergy long continued to exercise great influence. In April, 1648, by their means* the House of Commons found itself compelled to retract some of their strongest measures, and to agree to a vote that they would not alter the form of government by King, Lords and Commons. But before the end of the year, the Constitutional party in the House of Commons had dwindled into a minority, and the Presbyterian Members were expelled, or, as the phrase of the day was, "secluded" from the House. Immediately followed the constitution of the High Court of Justice for the trial of the King. In this alarming crisis, Mr. William Blackmore, in conjunction with forty-six others of the Presbyterian clergy, offered to Cromwell a letter of remonstrance, accompanied with the desire that it might be communicated to the general council of the army. In this bold document, which bears date Jan. 17, 1649, they tell the General that his recent proceedings are "unwarrantable," and "so clearly against the rule of the Word" of God, as to need on his part "timely and godly sorrow." They specify, amongst other "miscarriages," the seizing and imprisoning the King's person without the knowledge and consent of Parliament, and the unparalleled violence offered to upwards of one hundred Members in their exclusion from the House, and the imprisonment of some of their persons, many of whom were known to the remonstrants to be men of eminent worth and integrity, and to have given ample testimony of their real affections to the good of the kingdom. They also remonstrate against the new representative system proposed to be erected. They declare themselves "obliged to appear for the maintenance of their religion, laws and liberties, together with the constitution, powers and privileges of Parliament and the settled government of the kingdom, both, on the one hand, against all malignant counsels and designs for the introduction of an arbitrary and tyrannical power in the King, and, on the other hand, against all irregular, licentious proceedings of private persons tending to the subversion of them, and to the introduction of anarchy, confusion, profaneness and irreligion." The letter occupies eleven quarto pages, and contains many forcible and sound arguments

* Hallam, *Constitutional History*, II. 293 (2nd Edition).

against the violent policy of Cromwell and the army. It is remarked in the Abridgment of the Life of Baxter (I. 61), that the publishing of this paper was a plain running a great hazard as things then stood, and may be justly reckoned an evidence of the great integrity and honesty of the persons that subscribed it.

The Presbyterian clergy did not move Cromwell from his purpose, though some things are mentioned by Rushworth (VII. 1382—1384) which indicate a momentary hesitation on his part. They resolve, therefore, to make a still more public declaration of their abhorrence of the meditated death of the King. This was contained in a statement attested by the signatures of fifty-seven ministers. Mr. Wm. Blackmore's name, and the names of thirty-six ministers who had signed the remonstrance to the Protector, were affixed to this second manifesto,* which was probably subscribed on the 20th of January, the very day on which the Commissioners took their seats in Westminster Hall, and began the trial of Charles.

Some at least of the Presbyterian clergy of London did not confine their opposition to Cromwell to remonstrances. When the Protector's power was consolidated, and they saw the Independents, previously a despised minority, rising to influence and power, some of the Presbyterians began to negotiate an union with the Cavaliers, in order to effect in the person of Charles II. a restoration of the monarchy. Christopher Love, the minister of St. Ann's, Aldersgate, a man of high courage and considerable influence, took part with several of his brethren and others in a conspiracy to promote the expedition of Charles II. into England. The vigilance of the government detected the plot, and thirteen of the Presbyterian clergy, including Mr. Love and Mr. Blackmore, and Mr. Heyrick of Manchester, were arrested on a charge of treason. Cromwell's character is free from the charge of bloodthirstiness.† His

* In the Life of Baxter and Palmer's Nonconformist Memorials, the remonstrance and the second manifesto have been confounded. The names given as affixed to the remonstrance are really those which were subscribed to the second manifesto. The writer has both documents before him; the remonstrance is entitled, "A serious and faithful Representation of the Judgments of Ministers of the Gospel within the Province of London, contained in a Letter from them to the General and his Council of War. Delivered to his Excellency by some of the Subscribers, Jan. 18, 1649," 4to, pp. 15. The second document is contained in the *Harleian Miscellany* (orig. ed.), II. 512, and is entitled, "The Dissenting Ministers' Vindication of themselves from the horrible and detestable Murder of King Charles the First, of Glorious Memory. With their Names subscribed, about the Twentieth of January, 1648" (1649 N.S.). The original edition is described as printed in 1648, London, 4to, 6 pp. To the Remonstrance, the first name subscribed is Thomas Gataker, pastor of Rotherhithe; to the "Vindication," C. Burges, D.D., preacher of the Word in Paul's, London. It will thus appear that 68 ministers (Palmer adds two other names to the Vindication) publicly published before the event against the death of the King.

† If a statement given in the State Trials (Hargrave's folio ed., II. 178) could be relied on, it would seem that Cromwell had relented in the case of Christopher Love, and between the 15th and 22nd of August despatched from the North to London a pardon. The messenger who was carrying it express was, it is alleged, stopped on his road to London by certain Cavaliers and robbed of his papers. When they found the pardon of Love, they resolved to suppress it, remembering with passionate vindictiveness his sermon at Uxbridge against the King. So Love was executed on the 22nd of August, dying with a heroism of courage never surpassed. But the whole story of the pardon is treated (and very properly) by Mr. Carlyle as a fiction.

object was to intimidate opponents whose influence was only surpassed by the extravagance of their pretensions. A timely and unreserved submission would have probably saved the lives of all the conspirators. Most of them did submit, and were after a short imprisonment released. Christopher Love and Mr. Gibbons, being less compliant, were put on their trial before the High Court of Justice, and, being convicted, were sentenced to die. Mr. Blackmore was saved by the influence and earnest entreaties of his brother, Sir John Blackmore, who put in bail for him, and thus procured his early liberation. He turned this to account, and rendered Mr. Love all the assistance he could in preparing for and during his trial. Although it is not probable, under any circumstances, that a person of the mild and unpretending worth of William Blackmore would have been selected by the "Keepers of the Liberties of England" as a victim, the circumstances in which he was placed were perilous to honour and humanity as well as life, and the influence of a brother of known fidelity to the Commonwealth might be needed to protect him from the consequences of his share in the plot. The government had to prove their case against the two prisoners by the testimony of accomplices. To a noble mind it would appear preferable to stand side by side with the prisoner in the dock, and to share his danger, however extreme, rather than to purchase safety by appearing in the witness-box to give evidence against a friend. The Rev. Arthur Jackson, afterwards the ejected minister of St. Faith's under St. Paul's, when called as a witness against Mr. Love, declined to be sworn or to give evidence, saying, "I should have a hell in my conscience to my dying day, if I should speak anything circumstantially prejudicial to his life." Notwithstanding the remonstrances and threats of the Lord President, he continued firm in his purpose, and for his contempt of the court was fined £500 and sent to the Fleet. Mr. Jaquel, another minister and former friend of the prisoner, was less firm, and, after attempting in vain to be released, gave the required evidence. He afterwards deeply deplored his weakness, and his letter of penitence to the condemned man is one of the many interesting letters and documents illustrative of this remarkable trial. Mr. Blackmore was not only spared the trial of his fidelity to a friend, but was very speedily released. This State prosecution appears to have interfered with the meetings of the fourth Classis, which did not once assemble during the five months which followed the arrest of Mr. Blackmore and his associates. The Classis re-assembled in November, but with diminished numbers, and so continued, the numbers small and the business increasingly formal, till November, 1659, when the last meeting was held of which any record is preserved. The last recorded act of the Classis was to send Mr. Blackmore as one of the delegates to the Provincial Assembly. With that Assembly, if not previously, Presbyterianism, as an ecclesiastical establishment, itself expired.

Mr. Blackmore, we may reasonably suppose, was cognizant of the proceedings of his friends and party in hastening the restoration of the Stuart family. It would appear that in the memorable spring of 1660, he looked the future in the face without apprehension.

On Tuesday, May 1st, 1660, the very day on which the newly-elected Parliament resolved to recal the King, William Blackmore was married at the ancient parish church of St. Mary's, Islington, to Mary Chew-

ning. The Chewnings were a considerable family, long settled in the parish of Leeds, in the county of Kent.* The male branch of the family became extinct in the person of Thomas Chewning, the brother of Mary Blackmore. Islington was then a picturesque village, studded with mansions of the nobility and houses of entertainment for the citizens, surrounded with rich pastures and pleasant woods. The church of that day, utterly unlike the unsightly square building now known as St. Mary's, was a low but not unpicturesque structure of three aisles, "composed of the rough kind of masonry called *boulder*, or a mixture of flints, pebbles and chalk strongly cemented together." A well-proportioned embattled square tower, with a belfry on the north-west corner, rising loftily above both the church and the school, with its two gable ends and its pretty porch, gave beauty to the otherwise irregular mass of buildings. Here William Blackmore plighted his troth to the fair and excellent Mary Chewning. Possibly on that happy day he may have told his fair bride of the sufferings near that spot, rather more than a century before,† of the persecuted Puritans in the reign of Mary, and little knowing the dark storm of persecution about to break over his head, may have thanked God that those evil days were passed.

When on the 29th of May, 1660, the bells of every church in London rang a joyous peal to welcome home the long-exiled King, the Presbyterian leaders took a prominent part in the joyous proceedings of the Restoration-day. They deputed Arthur Jackson, whose fidelity on the trial of Love had won for him golden opinions, to present the King in their behalf with a Bible as he passed through St. Paul's Churchyard, which was in his parish. We may imagine William Blackmore and his bride stationed near his friend and associate in trouble, the venerable pastor of St. Faith's. In reply to the Address of the Presbyterian ministers, the King told them that "he must attribute his restoration, under God, to their prayers and endeavours." With equal sincerity he said, on accepting the richly-adorned Bible, that "it should be the rule of his government and his life."

Some of the Presbyterian clergy were ejected immediately after the Restoration, on the re-appearance of the sequestered incumbents. The death of Dr. Fairfax protected Mr. Blackmore from an immediate separation from his flock at St. Peter's. The magistrates of London, acting as Commissioners under an Act of Parliament for uniformity of ministers, &c., gave him a certificate of his right to the living, dated December 22, 1660, which still exists, endorsed with his own hand.

* Mr. Hunter has furnished us with a valuable note respecting a connection of the Chewning family. "Elizabeth, daughter and co-heir of Thomas Chewning, Esq., married Hugh Radcliffe, of Islington, Esq., haberdasher of hats to King Charles II. This lady was probably sister to Mary Chewning, who married William Blackmore. Hugh Radcliffe died in 1678, and was buried at Islington. (Lysons, III. 144.) He left to the parish of Mugginton, in Derbyshire, where he appears to have been born, Perkins' Works, the Book of Martyrs, and a book of Calvin's in folio. He had a son, Chewning Radcliffe, so that there was an effort in this family, as well as in the Blackmore's, to keep up that expiring (and I think lost) surname."

† Mr. Stoughton, in his *Spiritual Heroes*, describes the congregation of Puritans as assembling on *May-day*, 1557, in the pleasant fields of Islington, when their worship was interrupted by the emissaries of Bonner. Some of the Islington congregation afterwards suffered martyrdom.

It is not necessary to say anything of the anxieties and fears of the Presbyterian clergy during the Savoy Conference, or to paint the bitterness of their disappointment on beholding, as the reward of their loyalty to the Stuarts and their ill-placed confidence in the honour of the King, the Act of Uniformity. Mr. Blackmore cast in his lot with the band of THE TWO THOUSAND Bartholomewan confessors. The deprivation of his living did not, as was the pitiable lot of some of his brethren in Nonconformity, expose him to the terrors of poverty as well as persecution. Possessed of ample means, he retired at once to the village of Hare Street,* in Essex, near the town of Romford. He was probably induced to select this county as a place of residence from its easy distance from the scene of his pastoral labours, from its abounding with Nonconformist ministers and people, and from its being the original seat of his family, and where several of his relatives dwelt. More than 120 of the Essex clergy threw up their livings on the fatal St. Bartholomew's-day.

In the Abridgment of the Life of Baxter, it is said, "Henceforward" (i.e. after the Act of Uniformity) "the Church doors were shut upon them with contempt, and others filled their vacant pulpits, and they were left to spend their time in solitude and retirement, preparing themselves for another world, as being of no further use in this. They were much persuaded to lay down their ministry when they were denied the liberty of exercising it publicly; but the generality of them could not be satisfied upon many accounts. They feared the guilt of perfidious breaking their ordination vow, by which they obliged themselves to the diligent performance of their ministry. They were afraid of the sin of sacrilege in alienating persons who were consecrated to God." In accordance with this statement, Mr. Blackmore, though driven from his parish, did not think it necessary to abandon his ministry. He gathered a little flock together at Hare Street, to whom he preached once in each Lord's-day in his own hired house, neither seeking nor obtaining any other reward than the consciousness of fulfilling his duty as a minister of Christ.

The void in his heart occasioned by his ejection from his cure was, we may suppose, in part filled up by his little flock in Essex, and still more by the new and interesting duties which opened upon him when he became a parent. On New-Year's day, 1663, a son was born to him, whom he called Chewning, after his mother's family.

It is to be regretted that there are but few traces of Mr. Blackmore's life after this period. We may be permitted to suppose that it was comparatively tranquil and happy. His wife, though considerably younger than himself, died before him, and was buried at the chapel in Romford. Of this lady, one letter to her son, written when he was in his tenth year, is all that is preserved. It is a pleasing specimen of a Puritan mother's letter to an only child.

* Hare Street is about a mile distant from Romford. We are informed by Mr. Morison, a respectable Independent minister of Romford, that no Nonconformist interest is known to have existed at Hare Street. The ancient Nonconformist chapel of Romford was at Havering Well, about a mile distant from the modern town of Romford. The chapel was used until 1819, when the congregation removed to a new site in Romford. The old building was pulled down in 1823. No monument of the Blackmore family is known to exist at Havering Well.

"My sweet dear Chewning,—I heard by goodman George last week you were well, and also by Mr. Ferth and cousin Grafton, who both say they saw you at Chelmsford. Oh! dear child, bless the Lord, as I desire to do, for thy well-being. I hope you had leave to go thither, and somebody was with you, and had committed yourself to God's keeping before you went forth, which, as also evening, dear child, by no means neglect to perform every day. And daily, too, read the Scriptures, that thou mayest, as young Timothy did, know them from a child, and thereby become wise unto salvation and fit to be serviceable to God in your generation, and then to be sure God will bless you, and keep you, and preserve you every way, even to his everlasting kingdom. The Dictionary was sent to you the week before last by Mrs. Tracheon's cart, and I hope you have it (though you mention it not in your letter which came by cousin Comyns); if not inquire for it. Your father intends to send you by Daniel, cousin Comyns' man, two more books, and by him you shall receive a token from me. Remember us to Mr. and Mrs. Benson and their daughters, also to cousin Comyns and the little boys and your sweetheart most heartily. Tell cousin Sarah that her things she sent for shall be given to Daniel for her. Good child! ply your book and spend your time well; and the Lord bless thee.

"So prays your loving Mother,

MARY BLACKMORE.

"July 23, 1672.

"Your cousins here remember their love to you, and so doth Mary, who intends, she saith, to send you by Daniel a Hare-Street cake.

"These for Chewning Blackmore, at Mr. Benson's, near Chelmsford."

Calamy mentions an Essex ejected minister of the name of Benson, who came to the living of Little Leigh in 1662, who was befriended by Lord Fitzwalter's family, near Chelmsford.

Mr. William Blackmore appears to have married a second wife, whose name was Sarah Luttrell. There is a tradition in the family that she was a person of some pretension to rank and considerable pride. In his directions to his executors, Mr. Blackmore speaks of the plate she had before her marriage, and rings and gold. It is supposed that this alliance, which was contracted in his old age, did not promote his own or his son's comfort. His life was protracted to the year 1684. By his will he gave to his widow for her life, with remainder to his son, three houses in Aldersgate Street, London, besides other property. To the minister of Romford he left £10, to be put out at interest, and directed the interest to be expended in buying ten dozen of bread to be distributed to the poor who should attend the sermon annually preached at Romford chapel on Nov. 5, in commemoration of God's delivering the kingdom from the Gunpowder treason. He left sundry small legacies to his brother, Sir John Blackmore, to his only sister, the wife of the Rev. Mr. Hodges, and to other relatives, and to Mr. Peck, of Romford, the second part of Poole's Annotations bound, to be given to him by his executors when published. He directed his body to be buried at Romford chapel, "the place where his dear wife was buried in," and twenty shillings' worth of bread to be then and there distributed to the poor. He further requested that a sermon might be preached on the occasion of his funeral, to the living, not of the dead, from Romans vi. 23, last clause, *The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*. No gloves were to be given, except to those who carried his body, and amongst these he desired should be Mr. Wickins, who had been his associate in the fourth Classis, and

who, after his ejection from St. Andrew Hubbard, finished his ministry at Newington Green; also Mr. Whiston, probably Edward Whiston, an ejected minister of Essex, who continued to preach in that county until he was near ninety years of age. Amongst other directions, he expressed a wish that none but neighbours should be invited to the funeral, and that there should be "no service to the guests, except a cup of wine and rosemary, if it be to be had."

From the inventory of his personal property taken after his death, it appears that his house at Hare Street consisted of a Hall, a parlour and a study, a kitchen, a buttery, and four chambers. The property was appraised at £143, the books being valued at £50; the plate at £14; the linen at £14. 17s. 2d.; the pewter at £5. 6s. 6d.; a horse at £2. 10s. and an ass and foal at £5. The appraisement was doubtless far below the real value of the property; but the statement may serve to shew the simplicity of style in which our Puritan forefathers, even when possessed of competent means, were accustomed to live.

In a future No. we shall proceed to speak of Chewning Blackmore, the son of William.

THE TEMPEST AND THE CALM.

FROM THE SPANISH OF JUAN DE ARGUIJO. DIED IN 1600.

As on the glowing light I gaze,
The sun withdraws his shining rays;
The clouds, uniting, quickly spread,
And gloom on all around me shed.

And now the storm pursues its course,
Swelled by the south wind's raging force;
E'en high Olympus seems to shake,
When the hoarse thunders o'er it break.

But soon afar the tempest flies;
Once more the glittering sunbeams rise;
Their shining hues the waves retain,
Gladd'ning with light the world again.

While gazing on each beauteous part,
Hope springs to cheer my drooping heart;
My fate, like this, may brighten too,
And joys unknown the future shew.

BETH.

WHITEFIELD AND SLAVERY IN GEORGIA.

WHILE Wesley was denouncing Slavery in all its forms, pious Dr. Whitefield was engaged in introducing it, against the prohibition of the Trustees, into the State of Georgia. He, too, wrote home letters, telling that he had purchased a plantation and some slaves, the profits to go to his orphan house at Bethesda, "God delivering me (in this way) out of my embarrassments." (For proof that the State of Georgia is mainly indebted to George Whitefield for being a Slave State, a fact which we believe has escaped thus far the knowledge of American Abolitionists, see Stephens's History of Georgia, Vol. I. Chap. ix.)—*Rev. John Parkman (Christian Examiner).*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

American Unitarian Biography. Memoirs of Individuals who have been distinguished by their Writings, Character and Efforts in the Cause of Liberal Christianity. Edited by William Ware. Vol. II. Pp. 452. Boston. (London, Whitfield.) 1851.

THIS volume surpasses the first in interest. It contains eleven lives. 1, Of Dr. John Pierce, who was more than fifty years pastor of the first church in Brookline (Mass.), by T. B. Fox; 2, of Dr. Tuckerman, by Miss Carpenter, with some corrections by Mrs. Becker, Dr. Tuckerman's daughter; 3, of Dr. Channing, by Mr. Furness; 4, of the celebrated jurist, Joseph Story, by William Newell; 5, of Mr. Buckminster, by Mr. Thacher; 6, of Levi Frisbie, Professor, first of Latin and then of Moral Philosophy, in Harvard College, by Andrews Norton; 7, of Dr. Nathan Parker, minister of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, by Henry Ware; 8, of Mr. Thacher, by Dr. Greenwood; 9, of Anthony Forster, minister of Charleston, by M. L. Hurlbut; 10, of Mr. John Bartlett, minister of Marblehead, by Mr. Thayer; and 11, of Judge Howe, by Edward Hall.

No new facts are given in Mr. Furness's life of Channing; but the facts already known are put together with much taste and right feeling. A brief extract is all we can give.

"Amidst the simple beauty of the style of his published sermons and their large and flowing thoughts, we look in vain for the effect with which they were delivered. Of that, words can give no idea. They only who had the privilege of hearing him can appreciate it. They can never forget it. Herein in this one gift of utterance, he was an original man.

"How far as a thinker, a similar claim of originality may be urged in his behalf, is a question which the next generation will more readily decide than the present. To us it seems that the office which he so nobly discharged was, to give expression, simple and clear, to the thoughts and aspirations which were rising every where in intelligent and earnest minds. He was the interpreter of the highest spiritual progress of his day. He brought forward into due prominence that sense of the greatness of human nature, which the expansion of the intellect in so many directions was beginning with new power to indicate. Men recognized in his writings the record of their best thoughts.

"For the mission which he fulfilled he was admirably qualified by the delight which he took in large general views. He was always seeking the mountain-tops, whence he could command a broad expanse. And one of the beautiful, one of the holiest traits of his character, was the singleness of his aim in this respect. It had no self-regard. He had no thought of distinguishing himself when he climbed the heights. He sought to see, not to be seen; and the honour which he gained took him by surprise. Never was a writer at once so popular and at the same time so indifferent to literary distinction."—Pp. 152, 153.

Professor Frisbie is a remarkable instance of what industry in youth and resolution throughout life will enable a man to effect in spite of great physical obstacles. When studying for the law he was visited with a severe affection of the eyes, in consequence of which he was all but entirely deprived of sight. He became, however, first a teacher and then a professor in two departments in his Alma Mater. Some years after his blindness came on, he adopted a plan recommended by Dr. Rees in his *Cyclopædia*, by which he was enabled to write without the use of his eyes. It consisted of a square frame to be placed over the paper, in which a rule is so adjusted as to slide upward or downward, guiding the hand of the blind person to form written lines on the paper, at proper distances, by means of a pencil. It occurred to Mr. Frisbie that, having a great advantage over the blind, it would be sufficient for him to guide his hand by a ruler laid on the paper, and that he could thus write without a painful use of his eyes. Upon trial, something broader than a ruler,

as a thin octavo volume, was found more convenient. He accordingly wrote much in this manner during the latter years of his life. (P. 234.)

Notes on the Construction of Sheepfolds. By John Ruskin, M.A., Author of the "Seven Lamps of Architecture," &c. 8vo. Pp. 50. London—Smith, Elder and Co.

IF any where plain language is required and mystification is an impertinence, it is in a title-page. Mr. Ruskin, a man of acknowledged talent, ought to be superior to the folly of putting to a pamphlet on ecclesiastical authority and church government and rituals so deceptive a title as the above. Mr. Ruskin is opposed to the separation of Church and State, which he thinks "both vain and impious." But he declines to accept the Oxford definition of the word "Church" as "an external institution of certain forms of worship," and takes the scriptural explanation of it as "a congregation or assembly of men." To Oxford ears, many of Mr. Ruskin's notions will sound "both vain and impious." For instance, when he denies the holy orders of the clergy in these words:

"The blasphemous claim on the part of the Clergy of being *more* Priests than the godly Laity—that is to say, of having a higher Holiness than the Holiness of being one with Christ—is altogether a Romanist heresy," &c.

Again,

"As for the passages in the 'Ordering of Priests' and 'Visitation of the Sick,' respecting Absolution, they are evidently pure Romanism, and might as well not be there, for any practical effect which they have on the consciences of the Laity, and had much better not be there, as regards their effect on the minds of the Clergy."

In terms still more bold Mr. Ruskin advocates free inquiry:

"These I hold for two fundamental principles of religion,—that without seeking, truth cannot be known at all; and that by seeking it may be discovered by the simplest. I say without seeking it cannot be known at all. It can neither be declared from pulpits, nor set down in Articles, nor in any wise 'prepared and sold' in packages ready for use. Truth must be ground for every man by himself out of its husk, with such help as he can get, indeed, but not without stern labour of his own. In what science is knowledge to be had cheap? or truth to be told over a velvet cushion, in half an hour's talk every seventh day? Can you learn chemistry so? zoology? anatomy? and do you expect to penetrate the secret of all secrets, and to know that whose price is above rubies?" &c.

But startling and unorthodox as some of these positions are, it will astonish the well-informed reader to find that Mr. Ruskin has advanced so little in the application of the principles he lays down so boldly. The authority which he would deny to the clergy as a class, he would give to them in conjunction with the great body of the Church. He would exclude all Papists from civil government, on the ground that they should be subjected, in the operation of the church discipline which he desiderates, to excommunication, as "idolaters, as covetous and extortioners (selling absolution), and as heretics and maintainers of falsehoods." Not much more regard has Mr. Ruskin for the religious liberties of the Scottish Presbyterians than he expresses for the Roman Catholics. The Scottish Church, he asserts, has not "a shadow of excuse for refusing Episcopacy," or "for refusing to employ a written form of prayer." Mr. Ruskin's recipe for healing all church divisions, not merely in Great Britain, but in the world, is as pretty a piece of quackery as the pretence of curing all diseases by Morison's pills. In his view, all that is required to be done is to cut the term Priest out of the Book of Common Prayer, and to substitute for it Minister or Elder, and to throw out also the passages respecting absolution. As to the Baptismal question, he regards it as one of words rather than things, which, with Quixotic nonchalance, he says, "might easily be settled in Synod." If the clergy proved refractory, he would turn them out of their offices, "to go to Rome if they chose."

When the Churches of England and Scotland have settled their articles of faith and forms of worship, Mr. Ruskin purposes to translate the written forms and articles into the European languages, and offer them to the acceptance of foreign Protestants, with earnest entreaty that they would receive them; and so our imaginative author conceives the Protestant Church will become "one great fold," and Antichrist will be immediately overthrown. Mr. Ruskin is evidently one of Mr. Carlyle's perverses; like his master, he utters many brilliant sayings and some truths, but he is, like him, utterly indifferent to the logical sequence of his ideas, and not more careful about their consistency. The reign of this class of writers is, we are pleased to think, destined to be very short. Already there are symptoms of a wholesome reaction, and of a return to common sense, as a safer guide than transcendental intuitions.

-
1. *Remonstrances against Romish Corruptions in the Church, addressed to the People and Parliament of England in 1395. Now for the first time published.* Edited by Rev. F. Forshall. Longman and Co.
 2. *The Huntyng and Fyndyng out of the Romish Fox which more than Seven Yeares hath been hid among the Bishoppes of England, after that the Kynges Hyghnes Henry VIII. commanded hym to be dryven out of his Realme.* Written by William Turner, Doctour of Physicke. Basil: imprinted in the Yeaere 1543. Cambridge: reprinted in the Year 1851. London—Parker.
 3. *Wickliffe's Wicket, with the Articles wherefore John Frith died, and a short Life of John Wickliffe, by Thomas Janes, Keeper of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, 1608.* London—Parker.

THESE pamphlets—one for the first time committed to the press, the others reprints of old and very scarce tracts—are acceptable additions to the department of English ecclesiastical history. Many, who have no sympathy with anti-papal bigotry, will be glad to possess these singular documents, so illustrative of the resistance offered by our ancestors of the 14th and 16th centuries to ecclesiastical usurpation. The several tracts are carefully edited—the first by Mr. Forshall, who has prefixed a good introductory essay, and added a glossary and index; the two latter by Mr. Potts, of Trinity College, Cambridge. The Life prefixed of William Turner is creditable to his care and research. The "Remonstrance" was written by John Purvey, the friend of Wycliffe, his assistant both in his parochial duties and in his translation of the Scriptures, and the attendant on his death-bed. It is a very bold and extraordinary performance, and conveys a higher idea of the good sense and intelligence of the people of England at the close of the 14th century than is generally entertained. Apart from its theological and historical interest, it is a very curious mine, which may yield much instructive matter to the student interested in the progress of the English language.

The author of the second tract was a disciple at Cambridge of Latimer, whose zeal for the Reformation was so great, that he travelled through many parts of the kingdom, preaching wherever he went, until he was thrown into prison. He was liberated, but banished. On the accession of Edward VI., he returned to England, and received preferment, both as a divine and a physician. His medical degree he took at Ferrara, when on his enforced travels abroad. It was during his expatriation that he printed at Basil "*The Huntyng and Fyndyng out of the Romish Fox.*" The work is a vigorous statement of the unscriptural character of Popish doctrines, and an argument respecting the canon law, shewing that it is the law, not of the Church of England, but of that of Rome.

The third tract, likewise edited by Mr. Potts, contains Wycliffe's doctrine concerning the Eucharist, prepared and published at the very time that he was silenced for his heresy on this subject by the Chancellor of the University

of Oxford. For its close logic, expressed in nervous English, the "Wicket" of Wycliffe is well worthy of attention. Thus pithily does he state the absurdities involved in the Papal doctrine of the Divine presence in the wafer: "The thing which is not God to-day, shall be God to-morrow; yea, the thing which is without spirit of life, but groweth in the field by nature, shall another time be God! and still we ought to believe that God is without beginning and without ending!" That remarks and reasoning of this kind were not limited to the doctrine of the Eucharist, but were soon carried on by bolder spirits to the equally perplexing mystery of the Trinity, ought to surprise no one; and we cannot but hope that the active revival in our own day of the Protestant controversy will lead many Christian men to a simplification of their creed respecting the person of Christ and the unity of God.

Suggestive Lessons for the Study of the Gospels. Nos. I. and II. Langford, Birmingham.

The Teacher's Manual of the Life of Christ; for the use of the Younger Classes in Sunday-Schools. By Martha Blackley. Published by the Sunday-School Association.

BOTH these publications have the same object in view, namely, to assist the teachers of Sunday-schools in the communication of religious feeling and knowledge,—a task generally acknowledged to be important, and almost as generally felt to be difficult. Both assume that it is not enough, for such a purpose, simply to read the Scriptures with a class, without explanation and enforcement of what is read; and both recommend conversation as a means of fixing the impressions given. The idea, in the case of each writer, seems to be the same,—to offer something that may serve as a model and guide to the teacher, rather than to place a restraint on his own mental exertion, or check the development of his own individual resources for conducting the work of education. But we are bound to say that there is a great contrast in the manner in which the idea is carried out in these two little works.

There is no topic connected with Sunday-schools on which more stress ought to be laid, at the present moment, than the necessity and propriety of making them a means of *spiritual* culture. In some instances, so much attention is bestowed on intellectual training, so many of the hours of the Sunday employed in communicating a smattering of grammar, geography and even science, that religion is almost exiled from what should be its natural home. In others (the great majority), the larger proportion of the school hours are employed in reading the Bible, or in learning and reciting hymns and catechisms. It is only here and there that you find a teacher who is really giving religious instruction. For it is not enough to learn by rote either creeds of faith or precepts of morality; it is not enough to read the pages of scripture, even if this be accompanied by a full and accurate explanation of geography, manners and customs, &c.; what we want is to give our scholars clear and consistent religious ideas, and to excite in them warm and strong religious feelings. Every one who offers a suggestion as to the best mode of doing this deserves our thanks for the attempt; but, at the same time, the importance of the topic, and the necessity that only the best books should be taken as guides, must make us additionally strict in our examination and candid in our criticism of those which are candidates for such a post.

"Suggestive Lessons" are declared to be "the result of earnest study with many parents, teachers and younger friends." It is added, "these lessons should never be used as a catechism to be learned by rote,—unless by the teacher. To a few questions the answer is evident, and therefore omitted. The words of reply may be different with every pupil." They are meant, therefore, it seems, to serve as models to shew us how to teach, and more for private study than to be brought out before a class. For this purpose they seem excellently fitted. After a few remarks of an introductory nature, some

of which contain suggestive thoughts of considerable value, the writer takes the miracle at Cana in Galilee, John ii. 1—11, as a subject, and gives a series of questions on each verse, which are to be asked by the teacher when the whole section has been previously read over. A brief recapitulation follows; an anecdote and a suitable hymn conclude the lesson. No teacher can study one of these little numbers without being better fitted for his work by its perusal; and the depth of spiritual experience and warmth of devotional feeling which some parts indicate, only require to be gained by each, in order to make the humblest labourer indeed blessed in his labour. We strongly recommend them to notice, and (without admiring all the details) believe them to be calculated to do good wherever they are studied.

"The Teacher's Manual of the Life of Christ" professes to be "designed for such classes in the Sunday-school as are entirely ignorant and uninformed, though they may have attained to an age considerably beyond what is usually termed infancy." For such a class of scholars we should prefer that they should read the narratives of the Gospels (either from the Testament or some selection), and that the teacher should converse with them about it. Indeed, the writer seems to think so; and if this is to be the plan, all that is required is to give the teacher *models* to afford an idea of the method to be pursued; it is quite unnecessary to go through the whole life of Christ. Such a book must be used in one of two ways,—it must either be simply a model, for which it is unnecessarily extended; or it must be literally read from to the class, in which case it would become very formal, and therefore have little effect. We are compelled also to object to many of the expressions used, which are little calculated for a class "considerably beyond what is usually called infancy." Such are the frequent use of "children" as a form of address—"they laid the little baby in the manger, where the cattle were feeding. Ah! poor baby!"—"Many go from their parents' care to frolic mischievously, and idle about, and *may be even to throw stones.*" These are from the first few pages, and such expressions would rather raise a smile than excite right feeling with many Sunday scholars. Our conviction is, that the book as a whole does not come up to what is required; we should be sorry if our teachers were satisfied to take it as their model; and while it proves that its author is well fitted to teach most usefully, it is bare and meagre in its ability to communicate the power to others. To be useful oneself is a more easy thing than to increase the usefulness of our brothers; and if a good educational guide is a great blessing, an inefficient one, however excellent the intention which prompts its production, is mischievous exactly in proportion to the extent to which it may be thoughtlessly adopted.

The People's Biographical Dictionary. By Rev. John R. Beard, D.D.

THE completion of this work in four sixpenny volumes, and the addition of an "Appendix of Names inadvertently omitted, and of those who have recently died," claim for a moment our attention. To working men this will prove a valuable book of reference, and it contains much not found in our larger Biographical Dictionaries, which collectors will be glad to have in so portable a size and at so small a cost. Some interesting memoirs are given of working men in Lancashire who have pursued botany with great industry, and in some cases with results that might shame natural historians in easy circumstances. We have observed one inadvertent statement. Jeremy Collier is styled "a zealous Nonconformist minister." It would better describe the circumstances of the case if he were called a zealous nonjuring clergyman. In one sense he was a Nonconformist, but his Nonconformity was civil rather than ecclesiastical.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Provincial Meeting.

The anniversary of this, which is in all probability the oldest Nonconformist assembly in England, was held on Thursday, June 19, at Altringham, in Cheshire. The day was fine, and notwithstanding the absence in London of many of the ministers of the counties of Lancaster and Chester, the attendance was very good. The ministers who attended the Provincial Meeting or the Widows' Fund, or both, were, Joseph Ashton, Preston; R. Brook Aspland, Dukinfield; F. Baker, Bolton; Chas. Beard, Gee Cross; Francis Bishop, Liverpool; J. Colston, Styal and Dean Row; — Davis, Chowbent; W. Fillingham, Congleton; H. Fogg, Ormskirk; W. Gaskell, Manchester; F. Howorth, Bury; G. Hoade, Oldham; W. Harrison, Blakely; — Hubbard, Rivington; — Hibbert, Dob Lane; J. Layhe, Manchester; Travers Madge, Manchester; T. E. Poynting, Monton; G. V. Smith, Manchester New College; W. Smith, Rochdale; J. J. Tayler, Manchester; William Turner, Manchester; Charles Wallace, Altringham and Hale; Jas. Whitehead, Ainsworth; J. Wright, Macclesfield; W. Whitelegg, Platt; G. H. Wells, Gorton; — Wilkinson, Rochdale; and Messrs. Steinthal and Napier, students of Manchester New College. Amongst the laity, in addition to the members of the Hale and Altringham congregation, we observed Mr. Edward Grundy, of Bury; Mr. Robert Heywood, of Bolton; Mr. Robert Darbishire, of Manchester; Mr. Henry Long, of Knutsford; Mr. Chorley, of Manchester; Dr. Adolphe Dominici, of Geneva, &c. &c. The devotional service was conducted by Rev. John Wright. A very interesting sermon was preached by Rev. Francis Bishop, of Liverpool, from Judges viii. 21, "For as the man is, so is his strength." The preacher said that in the ages of barbarism physical strength and prowess were considered of the first importance. Valour was the criterion of virtue, and strength the measure of power. The weaker savage paid a sullen obedience to the stronger, remembering that "as the man is, so is his strength," and making the strength the standard of the man. As man advanced in art and manners, mere

physical force fell naturally into a rank of secondary importance, and intellectual cultivation became more and more the object of individuals and of nations. Art was born after art, and science after science, and their effects were seen in the order of public and the refinement of domestic life. But there were greater things than these. The whole strength of man had not yet been put forth. There remained an order of faculties by which we were impelled to seek after something that is not of this world. The intellectual, the social creature was in a state of defectiveness, until he has superadded to this the character and the conduct of a spiritual, of a religious being. Man is but in part human, until he feels that he may be in part divine. He is truly great only as the possessor of a soul, and as that soul is brought into communication with Him from whom it came and to whom it must return. It was to teach this truth that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory as the glory of the Son of God. In Christ it was fully seen that he who was strong in the strength of Almighty Love, had found out and revealed the great secret of man's perfection. This blessed truth he left as the common property of our race, the everlasting inheritance of our world. But how had this disclosure worked? Where were the tokens of its presence, the proofs of its power? Alas for the perversions of earth-born and earthly churches! Religion had been made to consist, not in the development of the love of God and its manifestation in the love of man, but in the subscription to certain forms, in the joining in certain rituals, in the repetition of certain creeds, in the meeting in certain places. From this cause we might in a great degree account both for the slow diffusion of Christianity among the heathen nations, and for its practical extinction among extensive masses at home. What Christian could look around him without a painful consciousness that the Church of Christ had departed from the spirit of its Founder? Do we see our churches and chapels thronged with those who heard the Saviour gladly? Is society bound together by the tie of Christian love? Are the multitudes in our cities and towns brought by the agencies of the church to sit at the feet

of Jesus? Alas! that we should be compelled to make to these queries replies so reproachful to our faith and consistency. The energies of churches had been so turned against the heresies of the head, that the far deeper heresies of the heart had been allowed to extend their baneful course unchecked and uncontrolled. Profligacy and intemperance and pauperism and crime darken our land, and few and inadequate are the efforts made to carry to the children of want and sin the glad tidings of salvation. A better spirit was beginning to shew itself; but momentous were the consequences of past neglect. The dark and fatal line of demarcation drawn by our modern civilization between the different classes in our large communities was productive of the saddest results. The poor man felt himself an outcast, and sought in vice forgetfulness or revenge. He (Mr. B.) was not blind to the faults of the poor; he knew them but too well; but he could not close his mind to the conviction, that if they were reckless, it was often because they were friendless and hopeless; that if they were bad, it was often because all the influences of goodness were removed from them. Society was awakening to a consciousness of these facts. Hence the various philanthropic societies which are the glory of our age. But institutions alone cannot do the needed work. The wise and the good must undertake the personal ministrations of kindness, and the outward inequalities of society be softened down by a practical recognition of man's spiritual identity. It was not charities that are wanted, but charity; not contributions of money merely, but of zeal, of knowledge and of love. The preacher concluded by an appeal to his hearers to adopt practically these views, and to manifest the power and the beauty of that pure religion and undefiled which prompts us to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to follow him who went about doing good.

At the close of the service, a collection was made to defray the necessary expenses of the Assembly. At the business meeting the chair was taken by Rev. Charles Wallace, the minister of the chapel. The roll of the ministers having been called by Rev. J. Whitehead, a vote of thanks to the preacher and supporter was moved by Rev. R. B. Aspland, who observed that sometimes, in making the acknowledgments due to the preacher of the day, exceptions and qualifications had to be made

to some opinion or statement. On that occasion he individually felt no qualification or reserve need attend the vote of hearty approval of and sympathy with the wise, touching and Christian sentiments put forth by their preacher. In seconding the motion, Rev. William Gaskell alluded to the great and pressing social importance of the question so ably dwelt upon by Mr. Bishop. They saw society in England rent into two discordant classes, the "two nations," as they had been termed, of the rich and the very poor. It was painful to contemplate the wide gulf by which these were kept asunder, but it was well that their thoughts should be directed to the subject. Mr. Bishop had done this earnestly and faithfully, and had spoken to the hearts of his hearers. Rev. W. Turner, Rev. J. J. Tayler and Rev. F. Howorth supported the vote, adding an expression of the wish to see the discourse in print. In acknowledging the vote of the Assembly, Mr. Bishop said he had not dared to anticipate from his brethren so unanimous an expression of their approval of the difficult and unpleasing topic on which he had felt it his duty to address them. Their vote came upon him with refreshment, as unexpected as it was cheering. With respect to the request to print his sermon, he craved time to take it into consideration.

Rev. William Harrison, as the oldest minister of the two counties (seconded by Rev. W. Fillingham), next proceeded, in the name of the Assembly, to offer an expression of kind feeling and brotherly welcome to those ministers who had settled in the province during the past year, and named Mr. Malcolme, of Chester, and Mr. Davis, of Chowbent.—Rev. Joseph Ashton laid before the Assembly a letter from Mr. Ainsworth, of Cleator, in Cumberland, expressing his grateful appreciation of the value of the religious services rendered at Cleator during the past twelve months by the ministers, and his desire that arrangements of a similar kind should be made for the next year. A conversation ensued, and several ministers expressed their satisfaction in the success of the services at Cleator and their admiration of Mr. Ainsworth's zeal and liberality. Messrs. Ashton, Wallace and Baker were then named as a committee to arrange the services for the ensuing year.—At this period of the meeting it has latterly been customary for the minister of the place to read an historical memoir of

his chapel and congregation. Mr. Wallace intimated that he had prepared a short account of Hale chapel, but as there was much business yet to follow, he suggested the propriety of postponing to another hour the reading of it. This was accordingly done. Before calling up Rev. J. J. Tayler to speak on the question of American Slavery, the Chairman emphatically remarked that they all agreed in regarding slavery as an outrage on the rights of humanity, and they could not but regard the Fugitive Slave Law recently enacted in America as an aggravation even of the horrors of slavery itself. Respecting the crying enormity of that law, he did not anticipate in that Assembly the least difference of opinion; and he felt assured that in discussing it they would avoid everything like violence, angry words and personalities.

REV. J. J. TAYLER felt that the resolution he had to move would have been better left in the hands of Mr. Howorth, who had undertaken to second it, and at whose request alone had he taken it upon himself. On various grounds he did not consider himself a suitable person to move the resolution: firstly, because he had not hitherto taken a prominent part in the Slavery question. This had not been on account of any doubt which he had felt as to the iniquity of slavery itself, or what would have been his personal duty had he lived in America. But he felt that the question for an Englishman was surrounded with difficulties. There was, indeed, an obvious distinction between mere political questions and questions of humanity. It was a difficult and a delicate task for citizens of one state to interfere in the political and social condition of another; and the question of Slavery in America might, perhaps, up to the present time, have been properly left in the condition of other analogous questions, i. e. to settle itself among those who were most affected by it and best understood its practical bearings. At the same time, though this distinction in the main was sound, and though interference of any kind was always attended with difficulty, it was clear that this difficulty must have its limits. To take a case: we might have political relations with a nation that practised cannibalism,—a practice which must affect our intercourse, and would justly call for a strong expression of public opinion. But with regard to slavery, he could not forget that our forefathers had entailed on America its curse and

its sin. Again, a man might clearly see the iniquity of slavery, and desire to abolish it, and yet feel the question, practically considered, surrounded with great difficulties even as respects the condition of the slaves themselves. Living in this country, unacquainted with many facts bearing on the case, he had felt it difficult to form an opinion, not on the principle of slavery, but as to the proper course to be pursued by those who were in immediate contact with the difficulties it involved; and for us to judge and condemn their proceedings, while the broad Atlantic separated us from all obloquy and all peril, seemed to him, to say the least, a very safe and easy kind of moral courage. It did, however, appear to him that the matter had now assumed a different character. He had been before willing to allow that our friends in America might be aware of practical difficulties which we did not understand; and while the question was in this position, he did not think that it became him to read a lecture to men who had difficulties to contend with which he could very imperfectly appreciate. The question had now changed. Those whom we had been wont to consider the friends of liberty and social progress, had accepted a law which gave a new support to slavery itself. The Fugitive Slave Law was not, he understood, at variance with the original principles of the American Union; but New England had inherited from its Puritan founders, among other distinctions and privileges, that of its common law—the principle that the very air of England is inconsistent with the fact of slavery. The recent Act, by reinforcing the principle of slavery, had brought two principles into conflict,—the old principle inherited in the Free States from this country, and the new principle introduced by the necessities of the Union; but if the New-Englanders had understood the true glory of their hereditary institutions, they would have withstood at this point the malignant element of the federal constitution. He thought that, as Englishmen and Christians, they were called upon to express their strongest abhorrence of a law so entirely at variance with humanity and justice. If he spoke of it at all, he could not speak of it in milder terms, and silence now might be interpreted to mean approval and sympathy. At the same time, they had nothing to do with the motives and characters of individuals; they must be left to the

dictates of their own consciences, and the judgment of the Being who can read the various motives by which the mind is swayed. He thought that they were called upon to express their decided protest against the principle of slavery; to affirm the right of every individual to his personal freedom and full exercise of his personal responsibility, which the fact of slavery annihilated at once. But he wished to do this without mentioning the names of individuals either for censure or for approval. It was sufficient for them, in explanation of their own views and as a security against misconstruction, to affirm a principle and to express their sympathy with it. He therefore respectfully submitted the following resolution to the meeting, which he hoped would obtain the assent and support of every individual present:—"That the members of this Association, profoundly conscious of the spiritual ties which connect them as brethren with the whole human race, and believing that every honest expression of public opinion must deepen and diffuse the general influences which secure the final triumph of Truth and Right, cannot, as Englishmen and as Christians, as dwellers on a soil the very tread of which breaks the fetters of the Slave, and the professors of a faith which has abolished all distinction of bond and free in Christ, refrain from thus openly expressing their strong abhorrence of the FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW recently enacted in the United States, nor suppress their grief and humiliation that a measure condemned alike by the spirit of the Gospel and the principles of Natural Justice, should have been sanctioned and accepted by a people speaking the same language and sprung from the same stock with themselves, whom they have been accustomed to regard with pride and affection as the heirs, conservators and extenders of a freedom which they cherish as their own most precious possession; nor can they at the same time withhold their fervent expression of honour and sympathy from the brave, earnest and self-sacrificing men, in every church and under every form of religious belief, who in this painful crisis of their country's history have not scrupled to incur obloquy and discredit in the world, and forego long and valued friendships, rather than violate the eternal obligations of humanity and Christian brotherhood."

Rev. F. HOWORTH, in seconding the resolution, dwelt on the countenance

given to Slavery in America by the Christian churches of that country. (Our report of his speech has accidentally miscarried.)

Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP, in supporting the resolution, said that within the last few days he had seen the fugitive in London referred to in the touching document which Mr. Howorth had read, where he was suffering great privations from not having yet obtained any regular employment. And just as he was leaving home to come to that meeting, he had been applied to in Liverpool by a fugitive slave in behalf of himself and another fugitive, who, with their wives and families, had recently come to this country. When the victims of the Fugitive Slave Act were thus thronging to our shores, it was idle to tell them that the subject was one in which they had no concern. The question pressed itself upon their attention in its own natural consequences, and it was well for them to look at it carefully, and to inform themselves accurately respecting it, that they might be able to tear aside the sophistries with which it was sometimes surrounded and obscured. It was a most painful and humiliating thing to contemplate this stain on the fair fame of a country, whose institutions were in many respects so wise and admirable. But the fact stood out before them, and they could not ignore it. It ought not to be forgotten that the Fugitive Slave Act was passed as a sop to the Slave States of America. It was passed to allay their excited pride and indignation at California being admitted into the confederacy as a Free State, though Utah and New Mexico had also been admitted without any restriction of slavery. The people of the Free States were therefore answerable for this iniquitous measure as much as the people of the South. It was an Act of the Federal Legislature, and applied alike to the whole Union, and every American citizen who had not given it his uncompromising opposition was a sharer in its guilt. And what were the provisions of the Bill? It appointed officers in every county of the Free States to seize all fugitives who might be claimed, and required every citizen, when called upon, to give his help to effect such seizure, under a penalty of 500 dollars. It also put its ban upon common humanity, and should any citizen give shelter or aid of any kind to a trembling, exhausted fugitive, it subjected him to imprisonment for six months and a fine of two thousand dollars. And more

than all, by a most extraordinary provision, which he knew not how to characterize, it gave to the Commissioner, i.e. the Judge whose duty it was to decide in all cases of claims under this law, a fee of ten dollars if he sent back the alleged slave into bondage, whilst if he decided in his favour he was to have a fee of five dollars only, thus giving the administrator of the law a bonus to side with the oppressor against the oppressed. The law was worked consistently with the spirit in which it was conceived. At Detroit, not long ago, a Negro was brought before the Commissioner as a fugitive from Tennessee. The poor fellow asserted that he had been manumitted by his claimant for 700 dollars, and that his free papers, which would prove this, could be obtained from his friends in Cincinnati. The Commissioner, however, decided that he could not defer the case for the production of these papers, and added, that if produced they would avail nothing in opposition to the positive affidavit of the claimant. Another case illustrative of the unscrupulous severity with which this Act was worked had occurred. Adam Gibson, a free citizen of New Jersey, was arrested in Philadelphia and hurried off to slavery in defiance of the evidence he tendered to prove that, even according to American law, he was a free man. At government expense he was conveyed to his alleged owner, William Knight, of Elkton, Maryland, who, to his honour be it said, at once disavowed the ownership which had been affirmed by the Commissioner. But for the honesty of this planter, the poor victim would have remained a slave for life. The apparent apathy and insensibility of some who stood high in the Christian church in America as to the iniquitous character of this measure, he (Mr. B.) viewed with feelings of regret amounting to anguish. The recorded sentiments of some to whom he had been accustomed to look up with feelings akin to veneration, came upon his mind as a most painful shock. And it was gratifying to turn to those brave and earnest men, for whom the resolution expressed admiration and sympathy, who had dared to speak out with Christian faithfulness and courage their opposition to this tyrannical and heartless enactment. He held in his hand a sermon recently preached to the third Congregational (Unitarian) society of Hingham by the Rev. Oliver Stearns, and published by request. In that sermon the preacher

says—"We are called upon by law and by the magistrate to assist in re-enslaving some of our fellow-men who have escaped from bondage. Can we do it in the name of the Lord Jesus? It is a practical question. There is no possibility of being neutral. By word or deed, we all give support to, or withhold it from, the Fugitive Slave Law. I affirm that no one can, consistently with Christian obligations rightly understood and felt, render it the least, either active or moral, support." Again this faithful preacher says—"Whatever allowance charity may suggest for the influences of custom and education upon some who dwell in the darkest portions of our country (and I am ready to make some such allowance), there is light enough here." And again Mr. Stearns says in reference to the too notorious declaration of a celebrated divine, that he would consent that his own brother, that his own son should go into slavery rather than disobey the law—"Brother or son, I thank him for the word. It gives the true test. I look around me: I try to think of some head of a family torn from it by violence, for no crime, by a fate to which drowning at sea or perishing of fever would be a blessed boon; or of some young man with bright hopes preparing for the business of life, or of some fair young woman,—of my own child,—put into actual slavery, with all its liabilities; I think of hopes blasted, of faculties stifled, of mind extinguished, of the doom on posterity,—and of this as a peace-offering,—and that I should consent to this. No! not to save the Union,—not to save anything,—not to save the Universe! For where is God? Where is the soul? Where is law, the law which has its seat in the bosom of God? Where is man's moral nature? Where is left anything worth saving? I consent to that! As soon would I consent to turn this house of our solemnities into a heathen temple, to become the priest of pagan rites, to help you to bind my own child on the altar and slay him as a sacrifice to appease the anger of an unknown God, that we might then go to our homes in the hope to dwell there in peace and safety. Thus I should feel about delivering a brother or a child to the fate of slavery. According to Christ, the fugitive is our brother or our child: he is the victim, the human peace-offering to an unknown God, to be sacrificed that you and I may prosper. And these victims to be offered by hundreds an-

nually! I should look upon the dismemberment of these States as one of the greatest political evils. But I can never yield principle to threatening clamour about disunion; nor can I measure the infinite with the finite, or weigh prosperity against the deepest demoralization." Let us rejoice, said Mr. Bishop, that there are in America ministers who can utter such faithful and Christian sentiments, and congregations who can decide to have them recorded on the printed page. He also quoted from a letter he had just received from the Rev. R. C. Waterston, of Boston, in which Mr. Waterston declared that the Fugitive Law was to him a matter of abhorrence and Slavery an abomination, and concluded by cordially supporting the resolution.

The motion was unanimously adopted by the Assembly.

The Secretary then announced that the next Assembly would be held at Bolton on June 17, 1852. A ballot was then taken for the supporter, and the choice of the Assembly fell upon Rev. G. H. Wells.

After some other routine business, the Chairman called the attention of the meeting to the absence of Rev. James Brooks, and regretted to inform them that it was occasioned by an accident at Morley, in Yorkshire, when travelling a few days previously by the railway. Serious as the accident was, there was reason for thankfulness that it had not terminated fatally. Rev. Wm. Harrison proposed a vote expressing the sympathy and condolence of the meeting with Mr. Brooks, which, being seconded by Mr. Aspland, who bore his warm testimony to the excellences of his venerable friend and neighbour, was adopted with many expressions of interest and regard by the meeting.

A vote of thanks having been tendered to Mr. Wallace for his services in the chair, the company adjourned to the Stamford Arms Hotel, where dinner was provided for a large party. The chair was filled by Mr. Wallace, and the vice-chair by Mr. Dennison Naylor. The afternoon was passed in the most agreeable manner. The memoir of Hale chapel was read, and led to some interesting conversation on several points of Presbyterian history. The document itself will, in compliance with a strongly-expressed wish of the gentlemen present, be hereafter inserted in the pages of this Magazine. Of the speeches delivered we have no means of giving a report. The sentiments

and the names of the speakers are all we can further give.

1. "The Queen."
2. "Prince Albert."
3. "Mr. Bishop and Domestic Missions"—Rev. F. Bishop.
4. "Mr. Wright and the Sunday-School Association"—Rev. J. Wright.
5. "Our Denominational Interests, being, as we conceive, combined with and conducive to the general interests of society: may we all, both Minister and People, be desirous to promote the diffusion of our opinions and the increase of our numbers; but may we be more anxious for the growth of a vital spirit of Religion than for any mere doctrinal distinctions"—Rev. J. James Tayler.

6. "Ancient and Modern Dissent, the changes through which they have passed, and the phases and aspects of the times which produced them and have continued their existence"—Rev. Franklin Baker.

7. "Unitarian Christianity,—may its chief aim become more and more like that of the Great Head of the Church, to seek and to save the lost"—Rev. G. H. Wells.

8. "The health of Mr. Whitehead, and thanks to him for his valuable services as Secretary of the Association"—Rev. James Whitehead.

9. "Manchester New College"—Rev. R. B. Aspland.

10. "Academical Institutions in general, not only those at home, but those abroad: may every establishment of this nature be rendered subservient to the objects for which it must have been originally intended, the promotion of solid learning, of useful knowledge, and of everything that can develop and increase the intellectual powers, moral dignity and social usefulness of man"—Rev. Charles Beard.

11. "The Education of the People on an enlightened and efficient plan and a free and comprehensive basis."

Before the party broke up, utterance was given to the common feeling of the friendly hospitality of the Altringham congregation, and the masterly manner in which their respected minister had throughout arranged for and presided over the meetings.

On Friday, June 20, the ministers who remained at Altringham met for the transaction of the business of the Widows' Fund. This society, founded by Dr. Priestley and others nearly ninety years ago, combines the two objects of mutual assurance and a bene-

volent fund for the relief of incapacitated ministers, and the widows and children of ministers, of the two counties of Lancaster and Chester. By judicious investments and the accumulation of profits, the Fund is now in a highly prosperous condition. It possesses in land, railway stock and mortgages, property estimated at £6882. 6s. 6d. The income of the past year, including balances of £456, was £1177, of which sum nearly £898 was invested. The annuities, payable on an increased rate adopted consequently on the prosperity of the society, amounted to £202. 17s. 6d. The Secretary stated that the property was becoming increasingly valuable, and that one portion of the estate was now coming into use as building land. The society offers advantages to its members in three ways,—first, by a retiring annuity, in case of their becoming incapable of continuing the ministry; secondly, by an annuity to the widow; and thirdly, in case of there being no widow, by a sum of money to the children of a deceased member. In addition, there is an auxiliary fund, the capital of which now amounts to £1793, the annual interest upon which is, if necessary, available for the purposes of the Widows' Fund, or, if not required by that, may be distributed amongst indigent ministers of the two counties, being members of the Fund, and their widows and children.

Attention has latterly been directed in the pages of our esteemed contemporary, the *Inquirer*, to the subject of the best mode of meeting the confessed and lamented necessities of Unitarian ministers. Most earnestly do we wish that a society on the principle of the Widows' Fund of Lancashire and Cheshire could be established for the whole kingdom. We deprecate the idea of a mere charitable fund, as calculated to depress rather than raise the ministerial character; but we should hail the establishment of a mutual assurance society on a large scale. The contributions of generous laymen might be received, to assist in making the foundations of such a society deep and broad and enduring. This was done many years ago in Lancashire, and on one occasion especially, through the influence of the late Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool, when doubts were entertained of the sufficiency of the original Fund for its prospective engagements. Let the Unitarian laity unite to raise a capital fund of £5000, and then, with the assistance of an experienced actuary, safe rules might be

constructed for a society to provide for ministers, being members thereof, who should become incapacitated by age or sickness, and, in case of their death, for making provision for their widows and children. We are satisfied such a scheme only needs the help of some one person of influence and judgment to set it in motion, to be carried into successful operation. Gladly will we devote a portion of our pages to the discussion of this subject.

We have only to add to our account of these Provincial anniversaries, that the ministers separated on the afternoon of Friday, June 20, highly gratified by the proceedings in which they had been engaged, and the opportunity of meeting their brethren in the ministry, and the zealous and kind-hearted laymen who give their countenance and aid to the Provincial Meeting.

West-Riding Tract Society.

The thirty-sixth annual meeting was held at Halifax on Wednesday, June 18th. Morning service was conducted by the Rev. J. Owen, of Lydgate, and a sermon preached by the Rev. A. T. Blythe, of Chesterfield, the object of which was to point out, for self-correction, the evils existing in the spirit of the Unitarian body. The discourse was, in truth, by no means complimentary to the body; and the preacher himself stated afterwards that he wished it to be regarded as one-sided, but as presenting that side of the picture which was commonly suppressed on such occasions. The charge of illiberality was at least an unusual charge, as laid against those who are commonly reproached for laxity, and whose whole tendency (as compared with all other denominations) is towards the faults (such as they may be), together with the graces, of freedom, individuality and practical morals. Nevertheless, Mr. Blythe afterwards received the warm thanks of the company for a most interesting and true-hearted discourse.

After service, the business meeting was held in the chapel, the Rev. John Kenrick, of York, in the chair. The report shewed about the usual average of books and tracts to have been distributed, amounting to 2732 in number, and £52. 10s. 9½d. in value, and the Treasurer's account was favourable. But the object of special and chief interest in the report and in the meeting, was the recent establishment of the Village Mission for the West Riding,

under the care of the Rev. Edmund Squire, with whom the Committee had made an experimental engagement for six months. Idle and Stanningley were the only two places thus far attended to, and at both these, the former especially, great good seemed to be in progress. It was understood that Mr. Squire's attention would be turned to several other places during the next three months.

The rules of the Society were altered, according to notice, so as to embrace the Village Mission in addition to the Book department.

The business meeting was adjourned at two o'clock to the school-room, where refreshment was provided, and about 70 persons sat down to table. After the meal, the Rev. W. Turner was called to the chair, the remaining business was transacted, and the usual socialities of such meetings found their place. Mr. Squire gave an interesting detail of his three months' experience. After the Tract Society's business was over, Mr. Wicksteed, according to notice, proposed a resolution in painful regret for the American Fugitive Slave Law, and the part taken in its support by many Christian ministers of our own as well as other denominations in the United States; which resolution was strongly supported by Joseph Lupton, Esq., of Leeds, and the Rev. J. Owen, of Lydgate, and unanimously adopted by the meeting.

North-Midland District Meeting of Ministers.

The annual meeting of ministers of the Presbyterian or Unitarian denomination for the North-Midland district, was held at Chesterfield on Thursday, June 19th, when the following ministers were present: Revds. T. Hunter and A. T. Blythe, of Chesterfield; P. Wright, Stannington; R. L. Lloyd, Belper; A. Macdonald, Derby (supplying for the Rev. H. W. Crosskey); R. Shenton, Hucklow; W. Sutherland, Flagg; T. C. Holland, Loughborough; B. Carpenter, Nottingham. Visitor, A. T. Ward, Esq., Sheffield.

On Wednesday evening there was a religious service, when the Rev. B. Carpenter conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. R. L. Lloyd preached from James iv. 8, in which the duty and advantage of drawing nigh unto God were excellently illustrated and enforced by a variety of

appropriate considerations adapted to the importance of the subject.

On Thursday morning the Rev. T. C. Holland conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. A. Macdonald, in the place of the Rev. J. G. Teggin, of Mansfield, absent from severe indisposition, preached from Acts x. 33. In the course of an able and interesting discourse, the preacher shewed the nature, character and duty of a Christian church, and the important objects and ends to be fulfilled thereby. After the service, in addition to the usual business of the Association, resolutions on two engrossing subjects of the present time were unanimously adopted, viz. Ecclesiastical Aggression and American Slavery. (See Advertisement.)

The ministers then dined together at a friend's house, and at five o'clock a congregational tea meeting was held in one of the spacious and handsome school-rooms erected during the last three or four years. Here a large number of the members of the congregation and their friends were assembled with the ministers, and a very agreeable evening was spent together.

After tea, the Chairman, the Rev. Thomas Hunter, in some appropriate remarks, introduced the business of the evening, and called upon the different speakers to respond to the sentiments proposed, viz., the Rev. R. L. Lloyd on the obstacles to the spread of Unitarian Christianity, in which he gave an account of a pulpit controversy with the clergy and ministers of Belper during the last winter: Rev. A. Macdonald on the chief purposes of a Christian Church, and especially by what organization they may best be fulfilled both by minister and people; this subject gave rise to an animated and interesting discussion, in which the Revds. A. T. Blythe, T. C. Holland and Wm. Sutherland took part, when some important observations were made on individual responsibilities and general associations, and the distinct duties of each: the Rev. B. Carpenter on the glorious memory of the Two Thousand Ejected Ministers, in which, with other remarks, he pointed out in what respects their example was deserving of our imitation in the present day, in their love of civil and religious liberty and resistance to all ecclesiastical domination, and in their earnest devotional spirit and practical piety: the Rev. P. Wright on the Education of the People, and the best mode of effecting it, in which, after some judicious

observations on different plans, he recommended the Lancashire secular scheme as on the whole the most practicable and least beset with difficulties. The Rev. R. Shenton and the Chairman having offered a few remarks, the proceedings were closed with a prayer by the Rev. B. Carpenter. During the evening the chapel choir sang some sacred pieces, and assisted to render the meeting what all appeared to find it, at once pleasant and profitable.

It may be also added, that the ministers at their morning meeting agreed to recommend that at their next quarterly meeting, in September, the question be considered, whether the annual meetings may be rendered more practically useful by embracing reports from the different congregations in the district, or by any other plan best adapted to that desirable end, and to report thereupon.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of this Society was held on Wednesday, June 11, at Essex-Street chapel, Strand. A large congregation attended the religious services. The sermon, preached by the Rev. Charles Berry, of Leicester, was characterized by great earnestness and simplicity. The preacher took his text from Luke xxiv. 46, 47. Amongst other hindrances to the acquisition of religious truth, he dwelt on the restrictive influence of creeds and establishments, and urged some reasons why we must not expect the same rapid success that attended the preaching of the apostles. Not only were they gifted with miraculous power, but their general opinions were in agreement with those of their countrymen, and they used the same copies of the Scriptures; whilst the Unitarian, who arrived at his views by reason and critical study, shut himself out from the sympathies of the multitude by a more refined philosophy, and in exposing the faults of the version of Scripture commonly in use, alienated those who suppose that he is rejecting the Bible. The consideration of circumstances which necessarily expose Unitarians to obloquy, should only render them more earnest to enlist the better sympathies of men in their favour, and this may be done by plain, earnest, serious, devotional preaching, and by evincing a practical belief in Him by whom we may overcome the world.

At the close of the service, the Society met for the transaction of business, the chair being occupied by W. Wansey, Esq. The Treasurer, Mr. Hornby, stated that both the receipts and expenditure for the year were rather above the average of the three preceding years. The receipts had amounted to £1050. 17s. 8d., and the payments to £885. 15s. 5d., being an excess of receipts over expenditure of £165. 2s. 3d., which, added to the balance of £164. 10s. 3d. at the end of the previous year, left a balance in hand of £329. 12s. 6d.

The Rev. E. Tagart then read the Report of the Committee, which contained many interesting details in reference both to home and foreign objects, and from which we select a few paragraphs:

"The exertions of your Committee have been impeded during the past year by the mournful decease of one of its most zealous, active and judicious members, the late Mr. Preston. That gentleman was a most efficient coadjutor in carrying out the objects of this Society. He allowed no claims of private business, in which he was much engaged, to interfere with his attention to the concerns and the usefulness of this Society. He rarely visited any distant part of the country without looking round him to observe in what way this Association could beneficially employ the means of good at its disposal. He brought to our council the habits of a man of business, of integrity and benevolence. He gave to every subject its needful share of attention and consideration, and he acquired the high respect and esteem of every member who acted with him. The Committee seized the first opportunity after his death of expressing to his widow and family their deep sense of his merit and of their own loss, in the following terms:—'That this Committee cannot meet for the first time, after the mournful decease of their much-esteemed colleague, John Preston, Esq., without expressing their high sense of his worth as a man and a Christian, and of his energetic and faithful labours and services in aid of the great principles to which this Association is devoted.'

"In active measures for disseminating the knowledge and influence of Unitarian Christianity, your Committee have had the pleasure during the past year of co-operating with and assisting the London District Unitarian Society, by whose arrangements and

instrumentality various courses of lectures have been given at literary and scientific institutions, or other rooms engaged for the purpose, in Southwark, in Marylebone, in Aldersgate Street and in Islington. Under the auspices of that Society several agreeable and useful evening meetings have been held during the year, at which favourable reports have been presented of the success attending their efforts. The ministers of London, and various ministers from the country, have been called into active service for the purpose of delivering the lectures, which have been fully attended, and been heard with marked satisfaction. Tracts to the number of nearly 5000 have been placed in the hands of the District Society from the stock of this Association, and freely distributed.

"A change, much to be regretted, has taken place in the fortunes of our old and valued agent, Chiniah of Secunderabad, who has been removed from his situation as supplier of grain to the army, under no alleged offence, but from certain changes in the regulation of the service. We know not what is the whole effect of this change upon Chiniah's means of livelihood, but we know that out of his former slender resources he devoted a very large proportion to the support of a school and religious service at Secunderabad. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of this Society, and of various gentlemen who knew him in the East.

"On the application of the Unitarian church at Toronto, in Canada, supported by the friends of the cause at Montreal, for aid in the support of a minister, your Committee have granted to that Society £25; and they hear with pleasure that the Society at Toronto has secured the pastoral services of the Rev. Mr. Dall, an American gentleman who was formerly in this country, and became very favourably known to many members of this Association.

"Your Committee have much satisfaction in reporting that they have received from Mr. George Bayly, of Plymouth, a sum of £500 Consols, to be invested in the names of Trustees to be nominated by the Committee, and the proceeds to be employed in the purchase and distribution of books and tracts, to be given in equal proportions to the congregations of Plymouth and Devonport, and the Western Unitarian Christian Union.

"It is known to the Society that your Committee have received instruc-

tions from the friends of Unitarian Christianity at Sydney, in Australia, to select for them a suitable and efficient pastor, for whose passage and outfit they have sent to our care a sum of £150, and to whom they guarantee for two years a sum of £300. Your Committee have felt this an office of great responsibility, delicacy and difficulty. They have taken such measures as appeared to them most judicious to find candidates for the situation, but from among those who have presented themselves they have not yet been able to make a satisfactory selection.

"Anxious to infuse a spirit of greater energy and vitality into the working department of the Association, your Committee have continued their exertions to find a suitable Agent and Secretary, who could devote himself heartily and effectually to its business and purposes. The matters that come before the Committee for consideration often demand an amount of thought and care to act effectually in regard to them, which men deeply engaged in various other duties and spheres cannot be expected constantly and gratuitously to bestow. Dr. Thomas Rees was kind enough, on the relinquishment of the Resident Secretaryship by Mr. Horwood, to tender such services as he could render to the Committee in his place in their urgent want of a confidential assistant; and knowing how conversant he had been with public business and with the wants and condition of the Presbyterian and Unitarian churches, your Committee were glad to avail themselves of his offer till such time as they could make arrangements for an agent and representative of the Society, such as they had been long contemplating. Your Committee are now happy to announce that they have made such arrangements with the Rev. Hugh Hutton, late the pastor of the Old Meeting at Birmingham, who has accepted the office of joint Secretary and Agent, with Dr. Rees, to the Association, from Midsummer to Christmas next, at a salary of £75, with a view to becoming Dr. Rees' successor in the office; and, in the first place, that he may have Dr. Rees' assistance in being initiated into all the operations of the Society, and particularly the management of its minute-books and accounts.

"Mr. Hutton engages also, for the first three months, to supply the pulpit at Southampton,—an arrangement which he had previously made with the

managers of the Southern Unitarian Fund. He will thus be actively employed in pulpit duty in a sphere of usefulness, partly marked out for him by this Association and its friends; and he will be able to devote himself with the ability and zeal by which he is characterized, and for which he is so widely known in our churches, and with the skill and power resulting from age and experience, to assist the Committee in carrying out the great purposes for which the Association was formed."

Subsequently to the reading of the Report, one or two of the resolutions (which appear among our Advertisements) occasioned some animated discussion, but eventually the whole were passed with great unanimity. At the close of the proceedings, the larger portion of the gentlemen present adjourned to Radley's Hotel, where they dined together, and afterwards spent the evening in the interchange of views and feelings on subjects connected with the Unitarian body.

On the succeeding evening, Thursday, a numerous company assembled at a *soirée* at the Freemasons' Tavern. The Rev. S. Bache, of Birmingham, presided with great ability, and addresses were delivered by Mr. Wansey, Rev. C. Berry, Mr. Hornby, Rev. E. Tagart, Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, Mr. J. Yates, Rev. E. Talbot, Rev. J. Gordon, Mr. J. Lawrence, Rev. R. L. Carpenter, and others. The evening was spent very pleasantly. Friends who had not seen each other for a long time were glad to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded at tea, and at the subsequent interval, for greeting and pleasant intercourse.

The Committee of the Association having declined to introduce the question of American Slavery into their report or resolutions, a meeting on this subject was held at Freemasons' Tavern on the succeeding Friday. Dr. Hutton, who was called to the chair, opened the proceedings in an address breathing the spirit of justice and charity. Mr. Estlin, of Bristol, gave a statement of the circumstances which led to the meeting. The Rev. Geo. Armstrong proposed the first resolution, confessing that his prejudices were strong where the cause of freedom and religion seemed attacked, and that moderation in such an exigency appeared injurious. The Rev. T. F. Thomas, of Ipswich, a friend of Clarkson, seconded the resolution. The Rev. E. Talbot supported

it, and said that as he had many members of his congregation in America, he desired that they should gain a hearing across the water by speaking with fairness as well as candour.—The Rev. F. Bishop moved the second resolution, regarding the mode of forwarding the opinion of the meeting to America, in a speech of deep feeling, and shewed that the Fugitive Slave Law was not only bad in principle, but unjust in the details.—The Rev. W. A. Jones, in seconding it, hoped it would not be inferred from what had lately taken place, that the well-known zeal of his Bridgewater friends in the Anti-slavery cause had at all abated. This was confirmed by the Rev. R. L. Carpenter: he and his old friends there desired to remonstrate against slavery, and to do all they could to remove it, consistently with religious freedom.—The Rev. J. H. Ryland thought the first resolution was scarcely comprehensive enough, and proposed another which extended their sympathies to the friend of the slave out of our own denomination. This was seconded by Dr. W. B. Carpenter, who thought that we should give credit to all who were conscientiously labouring in their respective spheres. All the resolutions were passed *nem. con.* Several fugitive slaves were present, who were greeted with an earnest and hearty welcome; and one of them, Mr. Brown, made a powerful appeal to the feelings and consciences of his hearers. Votes of thanks were very cordially passed to the promoters of the meeting and the Chairman.

Sunday-School Association.

The seventeenth public breakfast and annual meeting of this Association was held at Radley's Hotel, Bridge Street, Blackfriars, on the Thursday morning in the Whitsun week, June 12. Notwithstanding an unfavourable morning as regards weather, which kept away many friends from a distance, there was a numerous attendance of ladies and gentlemen, and ministers from all parts of the country were present. Previous to the breakfast, the Rev. Dr. Hutton asked the Divine blessing; and after the cloth was removed the Rev. Wm. A. Jones, of Bridgewater, the Chairman on the occasion, opened the proceedings of the meeting by an earnest address on the advantages of Sunday-school education, in which he pointed out the

services which the Association had rendered in its promotion, and the claims of the Society on public support. He then called on the Treasurer, Mr. Robert Green, to read his report on the state of the funds of the Association, and the Secretary, the Rev. W. Vidler, to read the report of the Committee.

The report spoke of the continued extension of the operations of the Association, and that most of the schools in connection with it were in a healthy and flourishing condition. From returns which have been received, it appears that in 72 schools in connection with the Association, there are 10,162 children and 1,684 teachers. In 47 schools not in connection with the Association, there are 4,682 children and 769 teachers; making a total in the 119 schools of 14,844 children and 2,453 teachers. Appended to these returns there are brief statements of connected institutions, such as libraries, saving-banks, week-evening classes and sick societies. In but very few schools do the exertions of the teachers seem confined to Sunday's instruction. Seventeen schools made returns last year, and have not this; in these schools there were then 1,331 children and 212 teachers. If it be supposed that upon the whole these schools have not diminished during the year, and these numbers are added to those of the preceding schools, the gross total of the 136 schools would be 16,175 children and 2,665 teachers—leaving 24 schools, of which the existence is known, but from which there are no numerical returns. The summary of last year, taken in the same way, was 15,918 children and 2,503 teachers. That of the present year shews an increase of 257 children and 162 teachers.

The report states that the Committee have at all times been willing to assist any school struggling with inadequate funds, and that this year grants of books varying in amount have been made to the schools at Horsham, Shepton Mallet, and to a ragged school which is conducted by persons of various religious denominations at Fal-mouth.

After the reports had been read, the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, of Canterbury, moved their adoption, which was seconded by the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, of Derby, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. J. C. Means, of Chatham, moved the second resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. H. Solly, of Chel-

tenham, and was as follows: "That this meeting has heard with pleasure of the increased efficiency and prosperity of many of the schools in connection with the Association, and, with devout thankfulness for the measure of good which has been accomplished, earnestly commends to the Divine blessing the teachers and scholars throughout the country, praying that those who labour may not be weary, and that those who learn may have teachable hearts given unto them."

The third resolution was moved by the Rev. E. Talbot, of Tenterden, and seconded by the Rev. R. L. Carpenter, of Neath, as follows: "That this meeting would again record its conviction of the importance of the operations of the Association, its sense of their value in the promotion and improvement of Sunday-school education, and its hope that it may obtain an increased degree of pecuniary support, and be thereby enabled to supply the general want which is felt in the schools, of a more varied supply of superior class-books."

The fourth resolution was moved by the Rev. J. H. Ryland, of Bradford, Yorkshire, seconded by the Rev. J. L. Short, of Bridport, and carried unanimously: "That this meeting views with satisfaction the successful operations of the Auxiliary Associations, and tenders its hearty sympathy to their members, and would at the same time recommend to its friends in all parts of the country the desirability of more fully carrying out the plan for the delivery of district sermons in behalf of the funds of the Association."

The fifth resolution was moved by the Rev. William Vidler, of London, seconded by Mr. J. C. Lawrence, of London, and carried unanimously: "That this meeting desires to express its gratification at the presence of Mr. A. Steinthal as a deputation from the Manchester District Sunday-School Association, and its fervent hope that a conviction of the necessity for the concentrated efforts of Unitarians and other non-subscribing bodies to forward the cause of the religious education of the young, unconnected with creeds and articles of faith, may be more and more felt in all parts of the kingdom, and lead to the zealous and cordial co-operation of all in the support of the best means for the promotion of that object."

Mr. A. Steinthal, who was received with applause, then addressed the

meeting, and gave an interesting account of the operations of the Manchester Society.

The Rev. H. Alexander, of Newry, Ireland, moved the appointment of officers, which was seconded by the Rev. C. Marshall, of Warwick; and after thanks had been returned to the Chairman, on the motion of the Rev. J. Gordon, of Coventry, seconded by the Rev. H. Hutton, of Southampton, the meeting terminated.

Dudley Double Lecture.

The yearly lecture at Dudley was held, as usual, on Whit-Tuesday, June 10th. The devotional service was conducted by the Rev. Samuel Bache, of Birmingham; after which a sermon was preached by the Rev. W. Cochran, of Cradley, from 1 Timothy iv. 8, on the connexion between Virtue and Happiness; and a sermon by the Rev. Matthew Gibson, of Kidderminster, from John xvi. 7, "Christ's Promise of the Comforter considered."

MARRIAGES.

April 27, at George's chapel, Exeter, by Rev. T. Hincks, Mr. ROBERT CHAPPLE to ELIZABETH TOMPSON.

April 29, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM CLOSKEY to Mrs. HARRIET ASHWORTH, both of Droylsden.

April 30, at St. Catharine's church, Liverpool, by Rev. F. Molineux, Mr. HENRY THORNELY to SARAH, daughter of the late John ALANDESLEY, Commander, R.N., both of Liverpool.

May 8, at Blackwater chapel, Rochdale, Mr. JOSEPH GARSIDE to Miss ELLEN HORSFALL.

May 14, at Prestbury, by Rev. W. C. Cruttenden, rector of Alderley, JOSHUA FIELDEN, Esq., of Stansfield Hall, near Todmorden, to ELLEN, eldest daughter of Thomas BROCKLEHURST, Esq., the Fence, near Macclesfield.

May 18, at the Unitarian chapel, Portsmouth, by Rev. Henry Hawkes, JOHN MASON to SARAH HORNDEN, both of the island of Portsea.

May 21, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. F. Baker, M.A., Mr. SAMUEL GARNETT to Mrs. JANE HORROCKS, both of Brightmet.

May 27, at the Octagon chapel, Norwich, by Rev. Joseph Crompton, WALTER STRICKLAND, son of the late James BIRD, of Yoxford, Suffolk, to CATHERINE CAPPE, second daughter of Mrs. SOTHERN, of Norwich.

May 28, at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., JOHN BROOKS, Esq., solicitor, of Ashton-under-Lyne, to AMELIA, second daughter of Mr. Andrew HALL, of Broughton.

June 1, at the Old meeting-house, Bessel's Green, by Rev. J. A. Briggs, Mr. THOMAS WICKENS to ANN, daughter of the late Mr. CARE, of Sevenoaks.

June 5, at St. Michael's church, Tooteth Park, by Rev. Archdeacon Brooks, WILLIAM HENRY BAINBRIGGE, Esq., of Islington Square, to EMMA FRANCES, daughter of Joseph Brooks YATES, Esq., of West Dingle, near Liverpool.

June 11, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM COOPER, of Newton, to Miss JANE LOWE.

June 12, at Hope-Street chapel, Liverpool, by Rev. James Martineau, JOHN PENDER, Esq., of Manchester, to EMMA, daughter of Henry DENISON, Esq., of Liverpool.

June 15, at the Unitarian chapel, Bridport, by Rev. J. L. Short, GEORGE COOPER to MATILDA CASE, both of Bridport.

June 15, at Gulliford chapel, Lympstone, by Rev. Goodwyn Barmby, Mr. WM. JERMAN, of the "Western Times" office, to Miss ELIZABETH WOODFORD DELBRIDGE, both of Exeter.

June 18, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. ISAAC CLAYTON, grocer, of Broadbottom, near Mottram, to Miss ELIZA TURPIN, of Roe Cross.

OBITUARY.

May 18, at East Farleigh, Kent, EDWARD NORTON, Esq., of Diss, Norfolk, in the 49th year of his age.

This sudden and melancholy loss will be most deeply felt by the congregation at Diss, of which he was a sincere and attached member, having for several years past fulfilled the duties of Treasurer to the society. He was a man of high integrity and conscientiousness, of gentle and unassuming manners, social, kind and simple-hearted. Though firm and consistent in the principles that distinguish Christian Unitarianism, he was always glad to recognize the spirit of Christ within all churches, however externally divided, and to hold the unity of the faith in the bond of peace. Beloved and esteemed by all who knew him, his death has caused an universal feeling of regret.

June 16, at his residence, Birmingham, in the 69th year of his age, Mr. THOMAS WRIGHT, thread manufacturer. The deceased was one of a happily numerous class, who, comparatively unknown to the world at large, are yet revered and beloved by a not small circle of friends, who have learned to appreciate their worth, and who regard them with enthusiastic attachment. Upright in his dealings, fair and open in every transaction, of genuine benevolence of character and great suavity of disposition, none, perhaps, have passed through a long life more blamelessly and honourably than Mr. Wright. Like Demetrius, he had the good report of all men, and it may be added, "of the truth itself." Plain and unaffected in manner, he at once made a favourable impression, which longer acquaintance served only to confirm and heighten. The face, beaming with cheerfulness, was the faithful index of the mind. His friends will not readily forget the hearty shake of the hand wherewith he constantly welcomed them. His life, till within the last year or two, when disease made a permanent and deep inroad on his constitution, was a scene of constant activity; whilst business was never neglected, he found time for works of benevolence and offices of friendship, and his hand was stretched forth liberally to relieve distress and to assist the struggling. Mr. W. was a generous supporter of charitable institutions in the town, and of those especially more immediately connected with

the religious denomination to which he belonged. In principle he was a strict Unitarian. He well knew and greatly valued that doctrine which he believed to be the faith once delivered to the saints, and, though averse to disputation, he was always ready to give a reason for the hope that was within him. His piety, whilst fervent, was rational and unostentatious, his faith being ever manifested by his works. Mr. W. was a long-standing member of the New-Meeting congregation, a very constant attendant on the services of the sanctuary, and a regular participant of the peculiar ordinance of our religion. He had in more early life and for a number of years taught in the Sunday-school connected with his own place of worship, and had for his contemporaries there men who have since risen to high stations, but who never, towards him, forgot the claims of ancient friendship. Mr. W. was ever ready to foster the efforts of societies formed for the promotion of scriptural truth. Hence he became a Trustee of the Unitarian chapel, New-hall Hill, and for some years acted as Treasurer to the institution. He was a warm promoter and most active supporter of the Birmingham Unitarian Domestic Mission, established A.D. 1840. He was from the first one of the Committee, and within twelve months from its formation became Treasurer of the institution, an office he held till within a few months of his decease. He ever took the warmest interest in its success, and, during the long and painful illness preceding his dissolution, his chief pleasure was to converse with his family and friends on the doings and prospects of a society so dear to his best and warmest feelings. At the last annual meeting of the subscribers, a handsome and well-merited vote of thanks to him, accompanied with expressions of respectful sympathy for his afflictions, was unanimously passed, and greatly cheered him. He was also a member of the Committee of the more recently formed New-Meeting Ministry to the Poor.—Mr. W. lay some months on a bed of great suffering; but he drew nigh to God, and felt that underneath were the everlasting arms. He knew in whom he had trusted. He was another bright example of the fact, that a Unitarian can die in peace, and with a hope that maketh not ashamed.